



A Plea for a Broader Conception of Architectural Education

By THOMAS E. COLLCUTT, PAST PRESIDENT R.I.B.A., ROYAL GOLD MEDALLIST

[Read before the Royal Institute of British Architects, Monday, 19 December 1921.]

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, —When a man retires from an active career and enters upon a time of comparative leisure, he should be grateful for the feeling that his life's work has afforded him a deep measure of happiness, and that the inevitable worries and anxieties arising in an architect's practice have become only a dim memory. He should be grateful too for the consciousness that, in the course of years, devotion to his art has taken a deeper hold on him; but he should not forget that he has yet much to learn, and that he is, in fact, still a student.

It is with this feeling that I approach my subject. It prompts me, you may think, to be somewhat harsh in my criticism, but the depth of my conviction must be my excuse for speaking with emphasis.

Let me begin with a word of warning. We architects have suffered and are still suffering, perhaps more than any other body of men, from the effects of war. The outlook is still gloomy. But, in spite of this indubitable fact, students and yet more students are encouraged to enter the schools. Mr. A. J. Davis, in a recent lecture, pointed out that in the Ecole des Beaux-Arts the percentage of applicants

ultimately admitted is 10 per cent.; those who do not pass have to enter some other calling. I understand a large proportion in our own schools are allowed to take the full course before finding architecture is not their bent. This is unfair to the student, it wastes years of his time, and is a handicap on his future—the schools have done him a wrong and are incurring a grave responsibility. Pray let us face this fact squarely and honestly.

I would suggest that no student should be finally accepted unless he can show, on a short probation, that he has a peculiar native aptitude or tendency to architecture above any other calling. This "aptitude" should be ascertained by a body of examiners independent of the schools. Of course such an examination should be confined to architecture; steel construction and perspective colouring should not be considered.

What a rich store of valuable knowledge we should gain if this world could be revisited by the shade of some Ninevite architect, one of an amiable and generous nature, eager to disclose the mysteries of his early education, of his later proficiency, and of his success as a practising architect! If, being an

enthusiast, he had, from his other world, kept an eye upon architects and their work from the remote ages, when he was actively engaged himself, until more modern times, what a fund of useful information he could give for the guidance of the student of to-day! And with what perplexity he would regard the portentous curriculum now presented in some of our schools. Having a full knowledge of the attainments of the old masters—say, down to the age of Wren—what an astounding revelation it would be to learn that an exquisite skill in geometrical drawing is considered as almost an indispensable means to an end. No doubt he would behold the students with pity, fearing their minds would become unhinged from too much learning.

It seems to me that principals of schools are not aware that almost all architects are wise enough to seek the advice of experts in steel construction, and in many cases in sanitary and electrical work—always, of course, with the concurrence of their clients. Only the rudiments of these trades ought to be considered in the schools.

I confess I have not been in touch with the education offered at the Association during the past eight or nine years; before that period I took pupils with the proviso that two years should have been spent in the drawing office (now an atelier) at the Association. These pupils were among the very best I ever had. In those days I had great confidence in the Association, but I have since been painfully disillusioned as to its merits in the present day.

The very last assistant to come to me emanated with credit from one of the schools, but he had no practical knowledge of the work he was required to do in my office. I had to dismiss him summarily with his confounded theories.

Another man passing from a school, and coming to me, could not calculate the dimensions for a steel floor girder carrying a distributed weight, although a few weeks before he had become an Associate. I had hidden Dorman Long's book. He was quite an excellent assistant, and I thought none the less of him for his inability to make this calculation. I could not have done it myself. Are there any practising architects who do practise expert engineering and design their own steel construction?

I am allowed to quote from a letter from a student of one of the schools, which is a drastic criticism on the system in the schools: "I sometimes feel I wasted years as a student, where we were taught nothing but design in the Classic

manner, no building construction to speak of, and an endless amount of history. This was all very well in its way, *but it has been of no use to me in much of the work I have been faced with in the past two years.*"

With your permission I will remark on a lecture on the theory of architectural education delivered in Liverpool and published in the August JOURNAL of the R.I.B.A.

Let me preface any disparaging remarks. I may observe that I join with Professor Reilly in his admiration of the clearness of expression and the keenness of intellect with which the lecturer has expressed himself, but I view with grave apprehension the system of education which he advocates, which appears to be in vogue in many schools as well as in Liverpool. Throughout the whole curriculum Architecture, as a Fine Art, seems to be almost a secondary consideration. Yet in spite of all the appalling range of studies set before the student, one can extract some amusement from the conclusions to which our lecturer arrives. For instance, there must be three grades in the practice of architecture: (1) the local practitioner, (2) the constructional expert, (3) the designer. To these add the arbitrator and the perspective colourist. I beg that these titles should be reconsidered. The local practitioner might be rung up in the very dead of night to attend a what's-its-name case. The colourist might, in a slack time, undertake some repainting in his parish church. To help him in his charges he might look up an old account for similar work: "To mending the Commandments, altering the Belief and making a new Lord's Prayer, 2 is."

Our lecturer advocates five years of study in all. Some of you may have read his lecture, but for the benefit of those who have not done so I will give a short summary of the subjects the student is expected to undertake in his five years so that he may be qualified for the particular branch which he wishes to take up. If, for instance, he elects to be a "local practitioner," he may omit "presentative technique and rendering," and I should think he would be exceedingly glad to do so.

A summary of studies suggested for the first three years embraces: Studio work, construction design, measured studies, history, archæology, theory of planning and design, applied geology, physics and mechanics, construction, materials, surveying, sanitation and hygiene, descriptive geometry, sciography and perspective, and presenta-

tive technique and rendering. "Presentative technique and rendering" is good. There is a lot more to learn including law, finance, etc., etc., but pray don't be alarmed, "he only wants to make your flesh creep."

Our lecturer admits that two periods of six months during the last five years should be spent in an architect's office!!—and there you are—fully equipped to suck the blood of the first client caught in your web of theories and coloured perspectives.

It is obvious to his "common sense . . . that omniscience nowadays is humanly impossible for any single member of the profession. . . . He cannot become an ideal architect." It takes nine men to make one tailor, but, thank the gods, only five students to make the ideal architect; hence his proposal to cut him into sections, *i.e.*, the practice of stereotomy—let us be scholastic.

On looking through some Liverpool prospectuses it is pleasant to find extremely good designs done by students who, having probably wisely ignored the greater part of the school curriculum, should, I presume, be classed as expert designers.

All these productions are for important public buildings, and are designed in what one may call a columnar style, having its birth in a great measure in the temples of the old world, while the general effect is imposing and pleasant, and in modern times quite appropriate in countries that are blessed with a brilliant atmosphere. But even in these countries the use of columns, forming colonnades, must be a serious obstruction to the light indispensable to the main building.

I would ask whether the schools are wise in requiring students to submit designs of palatial buildings—should not the subjects be mostly of a domestic or business or a civic character, and on possible sites, sites they would have to consider in real practice? Important public buildings are not of everyday occurrence. Certainly not with the grand and terraced open spaces shown in their designs, which add a fictitious value.

A few months ago I had the good fortune to see in our galleries several drawings of an imaginary restoration of a ruined city in Italy, the work of a student from the Liverpool School. These drawings were awarded the Prix de Rome. They were admirable drawings, and were extremely interesting as showing how splendidly the old town must have harmonised with the beauty of the surrounding country, an accidental though happy result that could

not have been conceived by the founders of the city. (The beautiful curve to the High Street at Oxford is the result, probably, of an old roadway.) The landscape shows the colouring student at his best, but the architecture, consisting of plain colonnades and indications of larger buildings, is happily designed. I confess, however, that I could not see that this attempt at imaginary restoration could possibly aid the education of the architectural student, although it might be interesting to archaeologists. Not only is the student not benefitted by such exercises as these, but the public is dangerously misled. A drawing that is pleasing to the eye, well coloured, and artistically put down, gives to the untrained observer the impression that the architecture must necessarily be good.

Works such as these are, to my mind, object lessons in how not to do it, but the Architectural Association seems to be encouraging these regrettable and really dishonest practices. I can call to mind published drawings issued by that body where the foreground and background are the especial points of interest, being charming bits of black and white, the trees perhaps a little sloppy, but still having a good deal of artistic merit from a landscape painter's point of view. The architecture, which ought to be the centre of interest, is sometimes good, often indifferent, not seldom very bad. Camouflage is a word over-used, but here I think it fits the case.

In the A.A. curriculum, now before me, there is a "third year" student's design for a gamekeeper's cottage with a perspective view. In the foreground of the perspective is a pool or "head" of water apparently flowing under an arch and under the cottage. On looking at the plan, however, one finds that the pool is a stagnant one, stopped by a deeper wall of the cottage, this arrangement being contrary to all building by-laws and to the laws of hygiene. The picture is charmingly drawn and is a good bit of pen work, but the design for the cottage is really entirely commonplace and thoroughly suburban, and is, too, without evidence of any study of architecture.

There are hundreds of gamekeepers' cottages scattered about the country, homely and picturesque in harmony with their surroundings, and suitable for their purpose. Many of those, for instance, in the Cotswolds might be studied for their architecture—but evidently have not been. Who does not know them—with their dog kennels and a display of dead vermin crucified as trophies of vigilance?

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

I hope I may be pardoned if I take exception to the title on the Association prospectus. The word "Architectural" has two distinct f's in place of two t's, and ends with a capital L. "Things are not what they seem."

But please understand that I have no quarrel with the making of beautiful drawings, *done truthfully*, to represent as nearly as possible the form that your thought, knowledge, and aspirations will take when your ideas become facts. I advocate water colour sketching from Nature as an aid to realising the beautiful. I began to dabble in the art when I was sixty-nine, and have since found instruction and delight in spoiling heaps of good paper; it has helped me to a greater love of Nature, and that in itself is a great gain. My one regret is that I did not take up sketching years earlier, thus acquiring something that would have led me to a truer feeling of the beauty of this world—which may be also the heaven we hope to enter.

I am grateful for the patience with which you have listened to my somewhat outspoken views. My apology is that I am profoundly interested in my subject. The future of our art, for good or for evil, lies in the hands of the students of to-day, who must be equipped to deal with newer wants and conditions in building, and with changing conditions of social life.

Though the remainder of this paper is more particularly addressed to students, I indulge the hope that it may be of interest to others.

I have said the schools cannot offer to the student an education other than a mere exploitation by means of which he can earn his living. I am greatly daring perhaps in believing it possible he may attain a broader education during his student days, an education "tending to the deepest good, intellectual and moral, to a purity of truth and a delicate perception of beauty."

Please allow me to cite an impressive quotation from Gilbert Murray. Speaking of Greece, he says:—

"Her great experiences were undertaken with the knowledge that success depended on the education of her citizens not only in efficiency, but also in restraint and generosity and a high conception of the dignity and possibilities of human life ennobled and advanced by beauty, wit (*i.e.*, wisdom), intelligence and, above all, by liberty."

Let me ask students seriously to consider these lines. With the help of teachers and lecturers a

way may be found by which they can train themselves in the education thus suggested. They should aim at getting a good knowledge of sculpture and painting, and, under direction, should enter upon a course of reading, choosing the best literature, both prose and poetry. In one branch of study no teacher is required; I mean in training the faculty of observation, that is in retaining a correct mental vision of some particular object. (Since writing this I find "observation" is in the A.A. curriculum.) These studies can be followed during and, of course, after, the preliminary work of the schools.

As to reading, I would advise you to turn to the chapter headed "The Troad" in *Eothen*. It encourages the student who has little or no Greek. Through Pope's *Homer's Iliad*, Kinglake, in his early boyhood, learnt to know the spirit of Old Greece. He was "not bothered with lexicons, by solid rations of 'Poetæ Græci' cut up by Commentators and served out by schoolmasters." You will remember that Keats made his first acquaintance with Homer through Chapman's translation. My own humble attempt with Pope's *Iliad* was sixty years ago—and failed. The last few years I have found pleasure in Murray's translations—but the lost years cannot be recaptured!

By intelligent observation, first observing and then drawing from memory, you may learn and absorb more than by merely drawing from the object: for the latter may be done almost automatically. The two methods should be studied side by side, together with the important work of measuring and plotting old examples of architecture.

Students should visit the Acropolis, study it early and late in the day, and under varying atmospheres. Here is a golden opportunity for cultivating the faculty of observation, and a precious means of stimulating the mind to a sense of beauty and an appreciation of truth in art. When one sees the Parthenon, one's mind is gradually impressed by the thought that this culmination and crown of Doric architecture did not spring from the brains of its designers complete in truth and beauty "like Athena all armed from the head of Zeus." They had before them the temples that preceded their age; they arrived at absolute perfection by many and slow stages, and by observing the failures as well as the successes of their predecessors. It was by a true valuation of these that they reached their goal.

It was in 1904 that I saw the Parthenon for the first and only time. We were a party of five, and by

good fortune all of us could silently contemplate and absorb the beauties of the great temple without breaking into fatuous exclamation. We were looking on the noblest remains of man's handiwork to be found on the whole face of this earth, work that has withstood the corroding action of climate and atmosphere for nearly twenty-four centuries, though it has been almost ruined by the action of man. The remains look as fresh from the hands of the Greek workmen, helots and barbarians, as though finished but yesterday. Time, it would almost seem, has lovingly cared for and protected the exquisite workmanship of these unknown men. In a sense these men are one with the architects and sculptors—the memory of whom and of the work they did may last for centuries to come.

You all understand entasis as employed in the Parthenon, how it pervades all parts of the building, so that the very columns, as it is supposed, radiate to a point in the sky, I believe, 4,800 feet high. You know thoroughly all the detail; you have drawn out the orders from the instructive "plates," which show so carefully and valuably the measurements of all parts of the "order." You may think, as I certainly did, that you can fairly visualise the reality. You cannot do so; nor can it be expressed by the cleverest perspective drawing. It is only by actually seeing the building that you can truly value the entasis, and that you can realise the refined outline of the mouldings, which show no commonplace bow-pencil rigidity of outline. Everywhere the light and shade have been perfectly considered; this is especially apparent in the fluting, and the strength that this seems to give to the columns. One is impressed by the exact proportion of all parts to the whole. In the Parthenon—in its perfection of design, colour, and workmanship—is beheld in visible form the glory that was Greece. To quote from one of Henry James's familiar letters to his friends:—

"There is a mystery of *rightness* about that Parthenon that I cannot understand. It sets a standard for other human things, showing that absolute rightness is not out of our reach. But I am not in a descriptive mood, so I spare you. Suffice it that I couldn't keep tears from welling into my eyes."

Another writer says:—

"The Parthenon holds fast upon your brain with its own dim and infinite meaning."

We saw the Parthenon and the surrounding buildings under a cloudless sky; had the day been a grey one, one's emotions might have been less intense.

We entered the Acropolis by the portico of the glorious Propylæa; we departed impressed and thoughtful. For myself, I was profoundly impressed and humbled by a regret that only as a student in my old age had I drunk from the fountain head of our art, and that I was absorbing an element only in that which is truth and that which is beauty. Of course, one can only play with one's imagination in reconstructing the interior of the Temple; one may conceive something of its beauty; yet, in spite of all, one cannot conceive being moved by the spiritual emotion (as opposed to intellectual) one experiences on entering a mediæval cathedral, or in reading beautiful poetry, or in the splendour of sunset.

It would be hard to define this particular emotion. In my own case what little I claim may have had its birth in my early youth, always attending a fine twelfth-century church when at home and a village church when away at school. On coming to London, before I was sixteen, acting on my mother's command, I regularly attended church. I did for a time, but entering a London church seemed like going into our town hall. I distinctly remember I really felt "going to church" was when I first went to the Temple. Here was all the difference. This feeling has never left me. Amiens is more to me than S. Peter's.

Some of this spiritual emotion we felt some days later on entering and viewing the glory of Santa Sophia. Here one did not find the perfection of finish so conspicuous as in the Parthenon; on the contrary, the surface of the porphyry columns in the great church is distinctly wavy. Curiously enough, this lack of finish seems here to be right; it gives a refreshing human touch, appealing to all, and these slight imperfections, escaping the mechanical, give an added and precious value to the whole.

There is at a short distance from the Acropolis a small Doric temple, the name of which I forget. In colour, and in the proportion of the order, it differs materially from the Parthenon; and it struck me as being commonplace and indeed unpleasing; the proportions seemed wrong, and as unpleasing as is the Doric entrance to Euston Square Station. It showed no intricate light and shade, owing, no doubt, to the muddy colour of the stone or marble. This is an object-lesson showing how much depends on site, on colour, on proportion and on atmosphere.

Students should especially study Doric flutings and compare them with those of the later orders: to

me the flutings of the later orders appear a "falling-away" from the ideal, and tend to make the column look commonplace.

The Parthenon impresses the beholder with being exactly the right size: it could be neither larger nor smaller. Since seeing it, I have ventured to question whether the grouping of the parts of Inigo Jones's beautiful Banqueting Hall would not have been enhanced if the building had been, say, one-third larger; this would have given opportunity for more wall space, perhaps on each side and above the window openings. It might be valuable to the student to make comparative studies in the proportion of this building.

In studying old buildings, keep an open mind and do not be led away by a style that may be fashionable for the time being. Do not take it for granted that Inigo Jones is the father of English architecture, though he certainly must be considered the father of Italian architecture as practised in England. Remember that you are heirs of the men who built our cathedrals and our manor houses.

Pray do not consider all the old masters infallible. Go to Vicenza and look critically at Palladio's buildings: with the exception of the "Basilica," and perhaps one other building, his work is not altogether beautiful. It would almost seem "he had most carefully divested himself of all æsthetic sense." Go to Oxford and examine the early work of Wren, and you will see that even Wren was not always successful.

It is generally accepted as a fact that the benign influence of Greek poetry and literature is traceable in the poetry and literature of all Western nations through succeeding ages down to the present. It has also been said that this benign influence is apparent in our architecture, and even in the very chairs we use. I confess that, being ignorant of

architectural history, it is difficult for me to find Greek influence either in mediæval or Renaissance buildings. But the subtle Greek mind, the Greek appreciation of beauty, may, I think, be found in Santa Sophia, which was built by the Greeks.

During the last three or four decades there has been a revival of Italian architecture in America, as well as in England. We have picked up threads from Italian masters, before and after Palladio, and threads from our own masters. We have woven these threads, without due consideration whether they had the quality of beauty or not, into patterns or samples expressing some of the evils and some of the good pertaining to the old masters. Would that some master-mind would arise and teach us how to capture Greek thought as it first influenced Rome, pointing out where the Romans just missed the beautiful, and thus guided, we might in time achieve in our buildings something of fine art.

Please allow me to cite a hackneyed quotation:

"The glory that was Greece,
And the grandeur that was Rome."

This always seems to me a subtle criticism, not intended by the author, of the architecture of the two countries. You cannot add to the supreme word "glory"; "grandeur," however, may easily sink to "grandiose."

Young men may indulge in visions of a style born of tradition and adaptable to the new conditions. But their visions must be exalted: they must not be confined to the mere work they are engaged upon. "Weary of the past," we are hoping for a loftier, brighter and simpler age bringing with it what Wordsworth prayed for: "plain living, high thinking and homely beauty." The self-education I advocate I believe in my soul to be right and sound. I have "preached" to you because, with the knowledge of my own early limitations, I have wished to help you to attain much that I have missed.

Discussion

Mr. E. GUY DAWBER, VICE-PRESIDENT, IN THE CHAIR

Mr. JOHN SLATER [*F.*]: Mr. Vice-President, you have asked me to propose a vote of thanks to my ever-young old friend, Mr. Colcutt, for the Paper he has read to-night, and I do so with a great deal of pleasure, a pleasure that is not really diminished by the fact that I do not find myself able to agree with a great deal which he has said. We have recently looked upon Mr. Colcutt as enjoying his *otium cum dignitate* surrounded by his books and pictures, and casting an occasional cyni-

cal eye upon us who are still in the hurly-burly; but from the paper he has given us to-night we get a very different idea of him. He is a veritable St. George, out for dragons, and having heard of this terrible dragon, Architectural Education, as given in the schools, he comes back to the arena, armed *cap-à-pie*, and goes for the dragon with all the vigour of youth.

I agree with him that criticism is always useful, and no institution that cannot stand criticism is worth any-

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

thing; but I do feel to-night that the dragon which Mr. Collcutt is fighting is, to a considerable extent, a Frankenstein monster, which he has evolved out of his own moral consciousness.

Let us look at some of the complaints he makes. He first complains that he got an assistant who had been with credit through the Architectural Association's schools—

Mr. COLLCUTT: No, a school; I did not name the school.

Mr. SLATER: At any rate, he had had some education, and he turned out a duffer. Well, Horace tells us that a great many brave men lived before Agamemnon, and I am afraid duffers existed before architectural education existed, and will continue to exist. But I do not think it is fair to blame the schools for individual failures. Then he has a letter from a student who states that the time he spent at an architectural school was very much wasted and did not help him in his general work afterwards. Is it not possible—I throw this out with diffidence, because I do not want to lay myself open to an action for libel—is it not possible that if the preliminary examination which Mr. Collcutt advocates had been in operation, this gentleman might have been told he had better devote his energies to something other than architecture? With regard to this preliminary education by an outside body before the student enters his course, is it a feasible thing? Every year a number of students leave college or school and start on their professions: some take up law, some medicine, some science, some architecture. But at the start they know nothing whatever about these subjects; and how can you examine a man on what he knows nothing whatever about? If anybody were to attempt to examine me in Chinese, I think it would be a fiasco.

Mr. COLLCUTT: I say that after studying for two years he should go before a body of examiners.

Mr. SLATER: I am coming to that. What, I think, can be done, and what ought to be done—and here I may say Mr. Collcutt has hit the right nail on the head—is that the professors and teachers in the schools, who are the only people able to judge, ought carefully to consider the work of the students after the first six or nine months, and if they hold the opinion that any of them have mistaken their vocation, they ought, in the most uncompromising manner, to warn them off the course. I think there is some danger, looking at the rivalry of the schools and the great natural desire on the part of all of them to have a very flourishing school under their control, and I am half inclined to think there may be a little relaxation of this weeding-out process. I am sure it is very desirable that the weeding-out should take place.

Mr. Collcutt said that architecture as a fine art is of secondary consideration in schools, yet very soon afterwards he complains of the students being allowed—per-

haps encouraged—to make picturesque settings for the buildings they have designed. I remember some artists who have designed the frames for their pictures; therefore I do not think it is very much to be deprecated that a student should be taught that there is something in the surroundings of his building, and that he may very justly endeavour to supplement the building by gardens and terraces, and even by rock pools, which may be stagnant water or not.

The next complaint Mr. Collcutt makes is that too many subjects are taught in the schools. I am bound to say that, at the back of my mind, I am a little disposed to agree with him; but it is a fact that a large number of people for whom I have a very great respect hold a different opinion. During the last 30 or 35 years I have listened to most of the addresses to students that have been given by the Presidents of the Institute when the distribution of prizes takes place, and they have, almost without exception, called the attention of students to the fact that architecture is not an easy profession, that drawing is not sufficient, that students must know a great deal besides drawing before they can attempt to practise architecture. I will quote only one short sentence from one of those addresses:—

“Although experts may be consulted on steel construction, sanitary work, electrical work and heating, yet the young student ought to be able to become master of the principles involved in such matters.” Those were the words of Mr. Collcutt 14 years ago.

Mr. COLLCUTT: I do not go back on that now.

Mr. SLATER: You must bear in mind that architectural education has barely attained its majority in this country. England has been behind nearly all other countries in endeavouring to promote architectural education. Take the Greeks. If there is any truth in the theories which Mr. Hambidge has lately promulgated, the architects of the Greek buildings must have been very skilled mathematicians and scientists. In Rome, where the profession of architecture was one of the most lucrative, it is impossible to conceive that there were not schools for teaching architects; and even in the benighted Middle Ages you will find that in the fifth century A.D. King Theodoric spoke of the honour of the architectural profession in terms which we should be very glad to hear from officialdom at the present day. We ought to look at the effects of this systematised education in the countries where it has been carried on for some time. Look at France. That was the first country which instituted any system of architectural education. Everyone, I suppose, will admit that the public buildings which were erected in France in the seventeenth century are of very high merit; and there cannot be a doubt, I think, that the excellence of these buildings was due, in a very large degree, to the supervision and training of architects which was carried out by the Académie d'Architecture, which was founded in,

I think, 1674, and that work was continued by the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Take America: that country has a far wider and more comprehensive system of education than we have. Have the results of that turned out to be bad? I need only refer to the wonderful series of drawings which lined this room a few weeks ago, to show that the education in architecture which is given in America has not done away with originality or spoil the designs of the buildings.

Architectural schools cannot do everything; they have their limitations, and they would do well to recognise them. They cannot—and I do not think they pretend to—turn out at the end of five years a sort of super-architect who is prepared for every branch of practice which may come to him. They cannot theoretically teach professional practice, and I should agree with Mr. Collcutt as thoroughly as anyone can that before a man attempts to practise architecture himself he ought to spend some time in an architect's office. But, granted these limitations, I cannot help feeling that the architectural schools do a great deal in guiding a man in his studies, in telling him where he goes wrong, in giving him help and direction in many ways. And as for the students themselves, I am sure that the rivalry between them, the opportunity which one man has of seeing and criticising the work of his fellows, of seeing how a particular problem is treated by one man differently from another, must be of benefit to him—to say nothing of the friendships which are formed in these schools, and which often last a lifetime.

Mr. Collcutt has been rather destructive in his criticism, but I rather miss any constructive criticism. Would he go back to the old happy-go-lucky, go-as-you-please days of the '60's and the '70's? I doubt it. A visit to Athens, to see the glories of the Parthenon, is a very good thing indeed; but how many, in their student days, can afford to go there?

Before I close I have one request to make to Mr. Collcutt. I would ask him to visit one of the most active architectural schools; I do not care whether he chooses the Association school, or the Gower Street school, or the Liverpool school. Let him see the work the students are doing, see the way in which they are being trained, and I cannot help thinking that if he goes there he will be very warmly welcomed, and any suggestions he may make will be, if useful, acted upon. If he will visit these schools, I think he will find some of "these confounded theories" which he talks about have really a very good practical result, and I hope he will remain to bless what he started out with the intention of cursing.

I must apologise, Mr. Vice-President, for having detained you so long, but I have a twofold excuse. I have been rather actively associated, during the last thirty years, with the formation and furtherance of schemes of architectural education in this country. I remember

the early days when some of us used to meet at Mr. Leonard Stokes's office and endeavour to form some sort of syllabus for a day school at the Association. Many were the head-shakings, and numerous the doubts as to whether any day school of the Association could ever succeed; but the puny bantling of those days has turned out a very stalwart youngster now. My second reason is that I have been honoured for many years with Mr. Collcutt's friendship, and I really do want to convince him that these schools and the effects of them are not so bad as he has been led to think. I can assure him that I think it a very sporting thing of him to have written this paper and come down here to deliver it. It is only too good a thing to think that our Past Presidents still retain an interest in what has gone before and in the work of this Institute, and I beg him to believe that it is by no means as a mere *façon de parler* that I move this vote of thanks to him.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon some other speaker, I wish to say that the President has written to express his great regret at not being able to be present, and that I have been requested by Sir Reginald Blomfield—who was coming here to-night to second the vote of thanks, but, unfortunately, is laid up with neuritis—to read you a few words from him. I will do so. This would have been his seconding of the vote of thanks:—

"Mr. Collcutt's charming, if discursive, Paper is in the nature of the apologia of a man who all his life has been an artist, and who, like all true artists, has found that with advancing years and increasing knowledge his sense and appreciation of beauty is ever growing stronger. He has touched on certain defects in our present methods of education to which many of us are alive—the excessive attention to mere draughtsmanship and its tricks, the neglect of ordinary building construction, the search for the grandiose instead of the search for that exact adjustment of means to ends and the elimination of the unessential which is, after all, the real business of architecture. Mr. Collcutt realises that three or five years' training is not enough, that not five or fifteen or any number of years is really adequate, because the true architect is always observing, always analysing, always endeavouring to reach the ultimate, inevitable form that exists in idea, but is never realised in fact. But this being so, one should not be too hard on our schools for failing to do the impossible; one would only suggest to them that they should study more closely what an architect has actually to do, and how best he can do it.

"I entirely endorse Mr. Collcutt's point that artists are born, not made. It has been the fallacy of this country since the days of the 1851 Exhibition that anyone can become an architect, or, for a matter of that, a painter or a sculptor, by setting out to be such and going through some sort of training. Our State-aided Art training proceeds on this assumption, which accounts

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

for the vast amount of incompetent work in which we abound. Some of us recollect the old days of pupilage, when offices were largely stocked with the fools of the family. My own opinion is that the initial endowment of a creative artist—and if an architect is not that, he is nothing—is much rarer than is supposed. One need not say with Nordau that all artists of genius are lunatics, but one should realise that those who possess the intellectual, imaginative and emotional endowment which will qualify them to pull their weight in the community as architects are few and far between; and if this fact was realised in our schools, there would be drastic changes in their organisation and methods.

"I heard it said recently that our young men no longer care for the art of architecture and are only interested in it as a business. I do not believe it. I am convinced that there is as much enthusiasm for this, the noblest of the arts, as ever; but if there are backsliders, and if those who start with enthusiasm are quickly choked by the tares, let me commend them to the study of Mr. Collcutt's address, and learn from him something of that high enthusiasm which has sustained him so well through his long and very honourable career."

Mr. Ernest Newton (R.A.) wrote as follows:

"I am very sorry I am not able to come to the Institute to-night.

"I have not seen Mr. Collcutt's Paper, so that I do not know exactly what his views are on the very important question of architectural education. It is, perhaps, a little early yet to judge the results of school training. Every system probably has some drawbacks. The old method of apprenticeship answered very well for industrious apprentices who had the good fortune to serve their time under a really capable architect. Being constantly in touch with the work of a master who was engaged in designing and carrying out real buildings, and not merely problems in design, was an invaluable experience for anyone who was wise enough to profit by it; but I think that even in the best circumstances most pupils would have valued and benefited immensely by some school training and in the preparation of projects conceived on a more generous scale than any they were likely to come across in their masters' offices. Unfortunately, however, every one under the old system did not always have the good luck to serve a competent or even conscientious master, and sometimes finished his term of apprenticeship with nothing much more valuable in the way of architectural training than a certain facility in tracing and copying specifications.

"Is not the ideal system a carefully arranged combination of school work and office work? A student who has profited by the excellent training which the schools afford might with great advantage to himself spend a year or two in an office where he would come in contact with actual architectural problems and see real

though, from his point of view, perhaps, somewhat humble buildings taking actual shape in three dimensions. The time spent in an office should be considered as an essential part of his training."

I will now ask Sir Aston Webb if he will kindly say a few words.

Sir ASTON WEBB, P.R.A. [*Past President*]: Mr. Vice-President, I seem to have arrived at that stage of life when I cannot attend a meeting without being expected to say something. I came to-night entirely to enjoy my old friend Mr. Collcutt's address, and I have enjoyed it very much. I think of Mr. Collcutt when he and I were quite young men and he won the Wakefield Town Hall competition, which we all thought, and rightly thought, a great achievement. And later on I remember when we were invited by the father of our President of to-day to a dinner, which Sir Frederick Leighton attended, and at which the competitors for the Imperial Institute discussed the conditions under which that competition was carried out. And I remember (with mixed feelings) when the announcement was made that Mr. Collcutt's design had been selected. I remember the charming red-brick house in Bloomsbury Square, with a sunflower as finial, a customary decoration in those days. And I remember the numerous other buildings, which have always kept in my mind a fragrance and a pleasure when I have thought of Mr. Collcutt and his work.

And now with regard to the more serious part of the Paper, architectural education. I like to look, more especially, upon the part of it with which I find myself in agreement. I find myself quite in agreement with what he said about the large number of students who are now entering the architectural profession; I think it is a very serious thing indeed. The outlook is not very favourable at the present time, but no doubt it will improve; I am sure it will. Still, I do not know how the number of students now coming in are going to find work. And, apart from that, it is only leading young men to a great disappointment in life to educate them and encourage them in a calling for which they have no real feeling. Some time ago I had a sort of epidemic of invitations to address students at schools of art round about London. I went to some of them, and enjoyed the proceedings very much. At one the master took me round the school—this was not an architectural school, but a general art school. And I saw some very terrible things, and I said to the master: "Do you ever advise a man not to become an artist?" "No," he said. "But," I said, "don't you think it would be rather a good thing, occasionally, to say 'I do not think you are adapted for an artist; I advise you to try something else'?" "We never do," he said. That, I thought, was a very serious thing. And, having gone round the school, I addressed the students and mentioned that I thought many of them, with the kindly

advice of the master, would be better advised if they were to take up some other calling. Since that time the epidemic of invitations to address art students has entirely ceased!

One point in Mr. Collcutt's address which interested me very much—because, I think, there is much to be said on both sides—was that he seemed to think students were invited to begin at the wrong end; that they were invited to design large buildings, of a kind which they would never have an opportunity of carrying out, and that when they had to design little cottages, such as they would have a chance of carrying out, they were not altogether equipped for the work. That is so, of course. But I am inclined to think that the big end is the right end to start with; that you want to induce a student to look at a whole scheme, and to think of the symmetry and largeness of it. I think you may see—I often look at it with that view—the same bigness in a small cottage as in a big building. I doubt if educating a man on a little cottage, such as a gamekeeper's cottage, would qualify him for building a great building, or a Temple, when he grows up. I speak with great diffidence, because I am not sure about these things; but I think that, on the whole, it is better to begin with the big thing, and that that bigness will be reflected by bigness in his work, even though that work is small in size. I happened only to-day to see a small silver George III. sauce-boat, and the man with me, who was a master, said: "This is the biggest thing you could make." It is possible by knowledge and training to get that bigness into small things which is very desirable.

Then I would like to say one other thing. I agree entirely with Mr. Collcutt about observation for students. When I was a student I went to churches, and measured little bits of mouldings and arches. We were not asked to do the whole thing in those days; we were asked to get a little Early English window, or the base of a porch. But we ought to try to think of the thing as a whole. I have said here before to-night that we ought to draw more from memory, not to plot it on the spot; to plot it from memory, then go back to the building and find out where the difficulties and errors are, and correct these on the spot. I remember many years ago I took a holiday at Southwold, when Walberswick was a great place for artists to go to. On this occasion there was an American artist who was instructing a very large class, and you would see of a morning a row of ladies mainly, but there were some men too, on the beach painting the sea. But they all had their backs to it. They had to try to paint their impression of the sea, and they would take peeps over their shoulders. The instructor's idea was that they should paint their impression of the sea, and not try to make an exact copy of what they were seeing. It took away from the students the desire to represent

subjects photographically. It is possible to measure buildings on the spot and put all down and yet not know the difficulties which the designer had in putting it together. That is what you have to find out. I am spending about half a day a week at St. Paul's Cathedral at the present time, and nothing could impress anybody more in regard to the extraordinary genius and general knowledge of Wren than to spend many hours examining St. Paul's. You say we must not worship Wren too much; no doubt we ought not to, but anybody who studies St. Paul's must worship Wren. He was a President of the Royal Society—I think he was its first President; he was a highly scientific man and a great astronomer, and certainly he was the greatest architect that England has ever turned out. So it does not show at all, I think, that because a man is instructed in mechanics, in engineering and such-like, that he need not also be the very finest and most artistic architect.

That is all I want to say, except that it is delightful to see Mr. Collcutt here, and for this reason: that I think as we get older we ought—I have tried to do it myself—while taking an interest still in one's own affairs, also to take an interest in the young men who are coming on, and so live again, if we can, a second life in the progress of the younger men who are going to take our places.

I thank Mr. Collcutt very much for his Paper.

Mr. E. T. HALL [F.]: Mr. Vice-President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to me to be present to hear my old friend Mr. Collcutt read this Paper, with his delightful youth, and his reminiscences going back, as they do, for a long period. In some respects one cannot, I think, agree with all that he has said; but I join with all who have preceded me in the intense admiration we all feel for him.

I should like to appeal for a little broader education of the public in architecture. We must not forget it is a very important thing to architects that there should be a cultured public who can appreciate their work, and I venture to think we should all, so far as our influence lies, use it so that in every school a part of the regular curriculum should be the teaching of sketching. It teaches boys to observe and to record their observations; and when such teaching is spread over the whole country, it will induce an appreciation of architecture, which will go largely to help architects, and do much for architecture itself.

I venture also to suggest—what has not been much referred to to-night—that a very potent influence in architectural education is the encouragement of travelling. I agree with Sir Aston Webb that the method of simply measuring up little mouldings has nothing to do with the breadth which is required in designing architectural compositions. If you travel—and I think travelling is the greatest education any man can have—you get a grasp of magnificent buildings, you see the environments in which they have been created, and you

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

can see and study the mankind of the district who have expressed their aspirations in buildings. That, I think, is of incomparable value. Take as an example Inigo Jones. He was not trained as an architect, and did not turn to architecture until he was 28 years of age. He went on a visit to Italy, but when he came back he did not start as an architect; he was engaged for nearly ten years in designing, mostly masques and scenery for theatrical plays. Yet in the magnificent backgrounds of palaces he showed the result of his studies abroad. It led to the Court and the nobles becoming his clients. During that period he made several alterations and additions to buildings, but it was not until ten years later, when he returned from his second visit to Italy, that he became the great architect that he was. There can be no doubt that in his design of the palace at Whitehall the inspiration came from the breadth and greatness of the buildings which he had studied abroad. Take, again, the case of Wren; he did not become an architect until he was over 30. He was, as Sir Aston Webb has already stated, a great scientist. He drafted the Charter of the Royal Society, and he was, in every way, a great and brilliant genius. The only journey he made, apparently, was one to the North of France and to Paris, when he made a very intensive tour of Paris. When he returned he seems to have been inspired—Paris was not then rebuilt: it was still a mediæval city—to make London the greatest city of the world, and he produced that beautiful plan which we have all admired, and which we regret was not carried out. If you take other architects—Gibbs, and Robert Adam, and Sir William Chambers—none of them had any office training whatever, except that the last two were for a short time in Paris under Clérissieu. Their education was entirely derived from their travels abroad, and they were all great men in their way. One man who was brought up in an office in those days was John Webb, and he was a pupil of Inigo Jones; he did not travel, and he never made any great reputation as an architect. I give you these examples to show the value of travel to an architect.

Mr. Collcutt has drawn attention to a programme of dividing architects into three grades: (1) the local practitioner, (2) the technical expert, (3) the designer. I cannot imagine anything more deadly. Just fancy a young and ambitious man starting out to become any one of those three! If he does not intend to become all three, he had better drop the idea of architecture. An architect, as I conceive, should have a general knowledge of everything connected with his building if he wants to be the master-craftsman. If you turn to Vitruvius, you will see he gave a much more exacting account of what an architect should be, and he almost appals you by the extent of the knowledge you are supposed to have.

With regard to the schools, beautiful drawings are very admirable, but they are not necessarily architect-

ture. That pupils should be taught to design large buildings I am sure is sound. They should also be taught to do the sort of buildings which are likely to come into the kind of work they will pursue. In the Architectural Association School, which is the one I know most about, I think the students are being trained on the right lines; they are doing excellent work, and they are given practical work to do. I have recently inspected designs for a printing works and for a recreation hall, and all the designs are well within the realm of what is usually required of a young architect who is beginning practice.

We must have been thrilled by Mr. Collcutt's remarks with regard to the Parthenon. He speaks of its rightness of size. I have not seen the Parthenon, but I have seen and studied St. Peter's, and there you feel that the size is not right; the scale of architraves and mouldings is so vast that the building loses the expression of dignity which you get in contemplating St. Paul's Cathedral.

In conclusion, I should like to add that while no school can make an architect, it can instruct and educate him. It conduces to good fellowship. It creates an *esprit de corps*, and I think we may rest satisfied that the students of to-day will be worthy exponents of the art of architecture in the future.

Prof. BERESFORD PITE [F.]: It is only due to Mr. Collcutt to say, at the outset, how much some of us have valued the extraordinary qualities of his early work. I do not know which design for Wakefield Town Hall Sir Aston Webb refers to, but I prefer the mediæval one. Mr. Collcutt made two. Whether he was directed to make the Renaissance one afterwards, or whether he made it from the outset, I do not know; but the two aspects displayed had a remarkable effect upon my mind as a student. And I remember the design for the Barrow-in-Furness Town Hall, another step in the same direction. And I think the Imperial Institute, in London, is one of the finest buildings of its era. I want to ask this: Were the conditions which produced the great men of Mr. Collcutt's early years so absolutely bad? Are the conditions under which we are conducting architectural education now producing similar men? That is the test. It is very interesting to take an academic view of the subject and discuss educational systems; but by their works you shall know them—it is by the fruits of a system of architectural education that the system must be judged. And I would suggest the great advisability, in these circumstances, of broader and longer views. If you review the progress of English building for the past century, beginning with the extraordinary academic and perfect work of the Greek school, then the enthusiastic work of the Italian school, represented by Sir Charles Barry, and the marvellous accomplishment of the Gothic school, I think you must hesitate before you denounce the methods by which such

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

results were arrived at, and sacrifice them in exchange for mere programmes of education. I think the time has come when this Institute can review the whole subject of architectural education with profit. Some fifteen years ago the Institute organised a conference on the then burning question of town planning; but I think the time is ripe for this Institute to organise a conference on the very important question of architectural education, and to review the courses which are adopted, not only at home, but abroad, in the study of our art. My impression is that we are running a risk of becoming too academical; we are not by nature as academical as the French. The Englishman is, after all, an extraordinarily free character; his genius has unexpected ways of exhibiting itself. It exhibited itself in a wholly unexpected way in Christopher Wren, in Pugin, and in many other brilliant workers we could name; and we should be a little careful in compelling upon the large number of schools in the country a uniform programme. The policy of the Institute, of late, has been to enlarge the liberty of these schools, and, I think, very wisely. It would be a good thing if it could enlarge that liberty still further and allow the schools freedom in the construction of practical programmes, not even specifying two years in an architect's office, but looking for the school, in the long run, to produce good buildings, and men who can do good buildings, because that, after all, is the test. From that point of view I welcome Mr. Collcutt's appearance on the field. We shall always judge him by his work, just as we always have enjoyed his presence and enjoyed his words. We shall mark the era as the Collcutt era, judging him by that evidence, whatever he may himself say.

And may I, in conclusion, say something about the course of architectural education? Ought it not to be this: the production of good buildings? Not a camouflage of interesting drawings. And are not our schools led astray at the present moment, just as our clients were led astray a generation or two ago by the perspectives—are not the schools led astray by the method of the Institute in requiring drawings of particular orders, and so limiting the activities of the schools in a dangerous way? Any review of their work at present will depress you by the universal sameness of the subject and the way in which it is treated. And so will a review of the competition drawings sent in for the Prix de Rome and the Gold Medal; they reveal a sameness of outlook which is un-English. And that points to the necessity of reviewing the whole work of the educational system at an early date. It will be welcomed by the schools. I cannot help adding that the recent Exhibition of American Architecture gives point to such a proposal. It is time that we reviewed our outlook. It was a very interesting exhibition, but it was selected from a continent; and if in connection with our Congress on Education here we could have a review, not of current

English architecture, but of English architecture covering the period from the much-despised but much underrated blessing, the 1851 Exhibition, to our own day, we should be able to judge exactly the trend of those forces which make for architectural progress.

May I add a suggestion with regard to the course of architectural education? I have suggested that the object of a drawing must be the production of a drawing which will guide a man in building. The next point is on the subject of architectural history. The one thing which is of importance to the designer is what the man was thinking about when he built, say, the Parthenon, or Westminster Abbey, or St. Paul's; not the impression made on my mind, not the impression made on the mind of a man who was not the architect. I remember Bodley saying to me that he always, when in Westminster Abbey, received the impression of how small man is, and when in St. Paul's how great a man is. Is it then really a matter of subjective psychology with the reverse influence on another type of mind? (Mr. Collcutt will excuse my pointing this out: he referred to the Theseum at Athens. It is a different size from the Parthenon, but it is of the same scale.) You may rack your brain to ascertain what the impression is; you might put it down to muddy colour, but you will not get at the essential facts until you ascertain what was operating from the calling, from the tradition, from the precedent, from the circumstances and the material, upon the man's mind when he did it.

I thank Mr. Collcutt for his Paper and for his buildings. Two doors off No. 36 Bloomsbury Square, in 1877, I was living in my father's home as an articulated pupil, and he will understand some of the wonder with which we looked at that building in our homely square.

Professor REILLY [*F.*] (Liverpool School): I feel that this is hardly an occasion for men of my, and a younger, generation. Mr. Collcutt's friends have paid the right kind of tribute to the Paper he has read. If I were to try to reply to Mr. Collcutt's remarks about the Liverpool School and the Association, I should probably alter the tone of this delightful meeting. My pleasure is in this: that I find the Association and the Liverpool School are in the pit together.

The speech to which I would rather address my remarks is Professor Pite's. I feel that he said some useful things. The real point about the schools, which have been a growth of less than twenty years, seems to be this: There was a tradition in English architecture down to the 'sixties and 'seventies of great enthusiasm, first the Neo-Grec tradition, and then the Gothic tradition. All the people lucky enough to be in offices in those times seem to have shared in the enthusiasm which was abundant and was firing every one. Those who, like myself, were in offices at a later period, the 'nineties, met with a vast variety of conflicting designs; no architect had a good word to say for the work of any other archi-

tect. Therefore it seemed essential, if English architecture was to rise to the quality of the work of the greater men of the periods mentioned, that there should be some coming together of younger men in schools to find out for themselves, to study and see if knowledge could replace the faith which was lacking. I think that is what the schools can do. The schools serve not only in stimulating enthusiasm and knowledge, but they also act as a sieve. At the time I am speaking of, when I was receiving what education I had in architecture, one had to be articled for five years. How then, if one was not suited to the profession, was one to get out of it? Only by sacrificing the articles. We now have an examination at the end of each year, when men are fired out who are not fit; so we are acting thereby as a means of saving the good men for the profession, and turning the bad men away. In my opinion, however, and in the opinion of every one who thinks of it, the schools are not there for the purpose of creating geniuses; geniuses arise; the Collcutts, if they are real geniuses, cannot be shut out. The schools raise the level of taste, and prevent blunders being made. If we walk about the streets in this neighbourhood, we see many blunders due to the men in the 'nineties; it is too early yet to judge of the work of the men educated in the last twenty years. I think some of you who visited Liverpool recently did see growing up in the town considerable evidence of the influence of the School. Sir Aston Webb has very wisely explained that to fire the imagination we have to put before students big schemes; we have to show them in big schemes the simplification of ideas a big scheme always involves, and that is why the big scheme is the best engine of education. Our main object is to educate architects. Many seem to think that the object is to provide cheap assistants, but that is the last thing which we hope to provide. Anyone who has seen the work of the schools of recent years, and not merely read their prospectuses, knows that construction is now carried out with unprecedented thoroughness. In each of the big schools one design in four is carried through to the working-drawing stage. While we have to fire the student's imagination on the one hand, we have to teach on the other the practical limitations of our craft. I maintain the leading schools are doing both with a success office training has never achieved, and could never from its scope hope to achieve.

Mr. W. N. ADAMS [A.]: May I say a few words on behalf of the students? Up to the present this evening we have heard everything from what we might say is the pre-war generation. Students are perfectly satisfied with their schools; they are quite satisfied up to the time of leaving their schools. But the students are not satisfied with the practising architects' offices which they go into. Excuse me, gentlemen, for speaking my mind, but Mr. Collcutt has done so, and I feel strongly on this point of architectural education. I feel that if

only practising architects would give students a real chance in their offices, London would be different.

Mr. HOWARD ROBERTSON, S.A.D.G. (Principal, A.A. School): I do not want to make many remarks, because the time is drawing to a close, and others have said, in a better way, things I wanted to say, as far as criticisms on Mr. Collcutt's paper are concerned. I think he makes one statement which is rather unfair to the schools. He says the schools are attracting people into the profession in enormous numbers. I have not seen figures showing that more are entering the profession since the schools were established than before. I think a number of people who previously entered offices are coming to the schools, and I should like to see some body, such as the Institute, find out how many more students are entering the profession. I think probably there are not more, and I think the men who are now coming in are very much better trained.

There is another point, and that is as regards discriminating among the students who come in. If you had a body of examiners judging students after two years, that body could not appreciate the student at his proper value, because he would not be in contact with him from every point of view—that of general education, the social side, and so on—for these make your impression of a man alter very considerably. Moreover, many men who are backward in the first two years develop surprisingly in the fourth or fifth year; and it is not fair to turn a man out until you are certain his career as an architect is not at all promising. I do not think you can prevent people entering the profession if they want to; if you turn them out of a good school, they will go to a bad one.

Then there is this question of backgrounds and skies and trees in drawings. Mr. Collcutt should come to the Association; he will see that that sort of thing is more or less washed out. I admit there was a reaction towards the excessive Beaux-Arts tendency in some of the schools. When reaction takes place you go to extremes. But that has been modified now, and we all realise that those things are merely accessories. The profession encourages pretty drawings, and they get into the Academy, and many people who decry pretty drawings come running to School-trained men when they want to win a competition. I have come into prominence regarding the gamekeeper's cottage. I saw a cottage like that in France, which was built on the edge of a lake, with water running under the terrace—not under the house. It was a charming cottage. I do not say the man whose work was illustrated has realised the original, but he did his best, and the gentleman who assessed it was a well-known man in the profession, and he thought it a very good drawing, in spite of what Mr. Collcutt has said. So opinions differ. And perhaps this man did not follow the examples in the Cots-

woulds because he had some regard for the laws of sanitation and hygiene.

The CHAIRMAN: We have had a most interesting evening, and I think that before I put the vote of thanks I must congratulate Mr. Collcutt upon his mental and physical energy in coming down and giving us this Paper to-night. We may not agree with all he has said, but at any rate the Paper has produced one of the most interesting discussions it has ever been my pleasure to hear in this room.

Mr. Robertson touched upon a point in his speech just now about the number of students in the recognised architectural schools in the United Kingdom. This afternoon I happened to see a return of the numbers, and, as far as this information goes, there are 884 students at the present time at the recognised architectural schools. If you add at least 400 or 500 articulated pupils in the various offices which are scattered about—and that is a very small estimate—and a similar number in the various polytechnic schools, that would make approximately 2,000 pupils studying architecture. I think therefore that as an Institute it behoves us to consider whether we are right in encouraging so many students to enter the profession at the present time, when the prospect of their making a living is so poor. But we do not want to touch on that gloomy side to-night. The whole Paper has been so very well discussed that anything I might add would be superfluous. Therefore I put to you a most hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Collcutt for his address.

Mr. COLLCUTT, in reply, said: Thank you for your very cordial reception, and especially so because I have really spoken out.

There are one or two remarks I should like to make. First, I have had, until the last eight or nine years, the very greatest confidence in the Association schools—I know nothing of the other schools—and in what the Association was doing towards the education of the architect. As I said in my Paper, I would not take a pupil unless he had been one or two years at the Association schools, and I found that they were among the best pupils that I had. I thoroughly believed in what they were doing at that period. The student went into an architect's office. He had, or should have had, every opportunity for practical work. In my case, for instance, I rarely had more than one pupil at a time; when I had two pupils I engaged the late Mr. Farrow to give lectures or lessons to the pupils in my office, in which the assistants took part. I was desirous that my pupils should learn something that I was not able to teach them. With the two years' advocate, the student could get all his practical knowledge, if he goes into a proper office. The very last pupil I had came into my office after a two years' training. He came on probation; but I found him so good a man that I engaged him as an assistant practically at once.

Reviews

LABORATORIES, THEIR PLANNING AND FITTINGS. By Alan E. Munby, M.A., F.R.I.B.A. With Historical Introduction by Sir Arthur Shipley, O.B.E., etc. Lond. 1921. 25s. net. [Geo. Bell and Sons.]

I wish to make a personal acknowledgment to Mr. Munby. He has dispelled one of my prejudices. I used to think that no book on the construction of laboratories was of any use. And here is my reason. Laboratories are built as part of the necessary apparatus of the teacher of science. Science is progressive, her teachers are progressive, and consequently everything that belongs to the equipment of the teaching is progressive also. You never meet a professor of science in his own laboratory without hearing him say one of two things. He either says with pride and satisfaction, "This laboratory was built under my own direction, and the architect has carried out in it every device I could think of for simplifying the instruction I want to give (or the research I want to carry out)," or he announces that his laboratory was unhappily erected before his appointment, and that, though it was well enough suited to the rather old-fashioned needs of his predecessor, it is hopelessly out of date as regards the requirements of present-day knowledge.

It results from this that the work of the laboratory architect consists of a highly specialised collaboration with the expert or experts for whom the new building is being erected. And I personally know no more delightful experience in life than the exercise of compound ingenuity which such a collaboration affords. Incidentally it often rewards both architect and scientist with a new personal friendship and with a pleasant mutual insight into the life-work of another man.

The architect has in any case to throw himself wholeheartedly and quite humbly into the science man's problem, and has to absorb as far as in him lies some knowledge of the meaning of the scientific problems at issue. The scientist on his part ought to, and sometimes does, realise that the architect's view of architecture is worth respect. In any case, if the resultant building is not, when finished, a neat, unencumbered instrument of science, either the architect or the professor has failed.

Thus it comes about that an architect who has had any experience at all of laboratory work very seldom needs the advice of a book on the subject, for the very first beginnings of his work on any new enterprise of the kind consist not even in the looking up of his own office records, but in setting himself, without any prejudice whatsoever, to learn the mind of the scientific man who is destined to make use of the building.

Far be it from me to suggest that the architect's own suggestions, bred of his past experience, are valueless,

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

or that the architect's own will has no place in the matter. But his new laboratory has got to be the best ever made, and he must lose nothing of any new light which his scientific colleague can bring to bear on the problem.

Mr. Munby's book has, as I say, converted me. Not only will it be of use to young architects who may have no office records at their back, not only will it be of use to scientists who may learn a great deal from it in regulating their ideas on laboratory schemes, but I confess that after about thirty years of practice in this very class of work I have found a great deal of instruction, as well as interest, in the volume. It is very clearly written, very well illustrated, and may well claim to be looked on as authoritative, for Mr. Munby writes with experience of his own and with eagerness to accumulate the experience of others.

PAUL WATERHOUSE [*P.R.I.B.A.*].

THE DESIGNERS OF OUR BUILDINGS. By *L. Cope Cornford*, with a foreword by *William J. Locke*. 5s. net. [*R.I.B.A.*]

This excellent book is in effect a plea for greater recognition by the public of the architect as designer. That is also the gist of the foreword by Mr. W. J. Locke, who longs to see the Press intelligently informed about architecture and intelligently criticising new buildings as they arise, and not only criticising the buildings, but saying something about the architects who designed them. "Personality—still more personality—always personality—of the architect." The Press devotes many columns to painting and painters; why not also to buildings and their architects? Readers of the public prints can go to exhibitions of pictures and see at their ease under one roof the output of painters; but they would have to make many journeys to behold even a small proportion of the output of architects. They can see in their favourite papers observations on their favourite painters, but they receive no information, far less any guidance, as to the merits or demerits of new buildings. The Press could do much to remedy this omission, provided their writers on architecture were trained in the subject—that is, were architects with a gift of happy literary expression.

Having established the thesis that the public ought to know something about architecture, but does not; that architecture can only be produced by persons trained in the study of it—namely, by architects—Mr. Cornford proceeds to show that no profession has so good an organisation for the help of its members as architects have in the Royal Institute, and that the public have here an instrument of high efficiency would they but use it in seeking assistance and advice, more especially when the public is impersonated by the Government in its widespread activities connected with building.

As may well be supposed, Mr. Cornford has no difficulty in making out a good case for the Institute in its various aspects: as consultant, as adviser, as the regulator of competitions, as the ultimate authority on the education of architects, as the guardian of professional honour, and as possessing the finest library of architectural books in the world. He writes simply and clearly and with an understanding of his subject, for his early training was that of an architect. He has now transferred his allegiance to literature, and has therefore no interested motive in praising the Institute. He speaks as a layman to laymen, and it is sincerely to be hoped that his book may be widely read by the public who are concerned in any degree with building matters. It will give them a welcome insight into a subject upon which their notions are at present rather hazy. There are nine illustrations, all portraits of eminent architects, mostly reproduced from pictures in the National Portrait Gallery, and from the admirable series of portraits of past presidents preserved at the Institute.

J. A. GOTCH [*F.*].

SOME LIVERPOOL STREETS AND BUILDINGS IN 1921. By *G. H. Reilly, M.A.*, *Roscoe Professor of Architecture, University of Liverpool*. 3s. 6d. net. [*Liverpool "Daily Post" Printers.*]

One puts down this little book with two regrets, the first in particular that Professor Reilly has not written more on this occasion, the second that generally as a writer his output has been so limited.

Paradoxical as it may appear, this book would have been better if it had been either shorter or longer.

The greater part consists of a series of articles, first published in the *Liverpool Post*, describing the streets and the architecture of Liverpool—and this part is all too short.

But as an introduction there is a reprint of a lecture the author gave the Liverpool Architectural Association, and it is this portion that might perhaps with advantage have been omitted; not because it is not as interesting as the remainder—it is intensely interesting and intensely provocative—but because it is written in a different key.

Here we are made to realise that it is as the Professor of Architecture of Liverpool University that the writer is addressing us; as he outlines his policy and thunders out his denunciations we are duly impressed, though perhaps a little rebellious.

But it is when we come to the articles that describe the city of his adoption that we are carried away. We no longer think of the author as a professor, as an architect, or even as a writer; he so captivates us by the interest of his subject and by the artistry of its presentation that he achieves the greatest triumph possible to a writer—he has made us forget the author in the subject.

As he conducts us from one part of Liverpool to another, sauntering with leisurely step up this important boulevard, pausing for a moment to make some illustrative comment on some particular building; rushing down this side-street, with a sudden halt to praise the lines of some architectural masterpiece, or with good-humoured mockery laughing at some terra-cotta absurdity, we feel that our author is in holiday mood—joyous, penetrative and illuminating.

It is in the inspiration of the moment that a man often utters the most profound truths, when he is so sunk in his subject that he has forgotten himself and his own special outlook; he speaks as the genius of the hour directs, and we unquestioningly accept what he says with happy confidence.

This small work is very far removed from a popular guide-book; it is something much more than that. Considered in its broadest aspect, it is a civic survey of Liverpool of infinite interest and value to layman and technician alike.

It is greatly to be hoped that other architects will follow Professor Reilly's example, and give us similar studies of the towns in which they live.

The work is urgently needed, and it is needed now. Architecture, more than most of the arts, suffers from a lack of qualified critics. Painting, the drama, music and literature all have an attendant train of able and expert critics, who inform and direct the lay mind and exert a very healthy influence on the exponents of these various arts.

Now it is the critical aspect of this book that makes it so outstanding, for Professor Reilly is nothing if not a critic, and a very able and informing critic at that. Not that all the criticism is of equal value; in particular, we very much regret the reference to the late E. A. Rickards which occurs in the introductory lecture. Professor Reilly quotes (he does not give it as his own opinion) some one as saying, in reply to a suggestion that it was a pity that Rickards never had an opportunity of designing a cinema or a theatre, that "Rickards never built anything but picture palaces." Now this remark, though perhaps superficially clever, is really very stupid and uncritical—stupid in that it showed no sense of what Rickards' work really was, and, incidentally, no sense of what the best kind of cinema work is.

Such a stricture only appeals to prejudice, to those who, alive to the formalistic and academic movement of the present time, can see nothing good in the work of the individualists who immediately preceded it, and whose generous fire gives a not unpleasant warmth after the chill received from much of the cold pedantic work that one sees to-day.

Rickards was a great individualist, but an individualist whose work had a monumental basis.

Now if, as one presumes the author of the remark

quoted intended, cinema work is showy and ephemeral, then to compare such work to Rickards was extremely foolish.

When one thinks of those strong masses with the heavily marked horizontal courses of stone in Rickards' buildings, as if each stone was laid to endure for centuries—in fact, of the whole spirit of his work—one is indeed amazed at such a comparison.

Possibly it is the Baroque influence reflected in these buildings which offends a certain indiscriminating type of modern; and about as much unthinking and prejudiced criticism has been applied to the Baroque as to Rickards.

The Italian Baroque, properly understood, was the wild protest of Italian artists when Spain had silenced all the free voices of Italy—when she had burned Bruno and stifled the Italian Church.

The Baroque may have become licentious in the reign of Louis XV. in its translated French forms—it may have even shown signs of this licentiousness in Wren's work during the reign of the Merry Monarch—but it was never licentious in this sense in Italy under the Spanish Domination.

There it was ever a heart-rending protest, and it is this wild note of beautiful protest that Rickards caught and sent forth as a challenge to all the shams and follies of his day, for Rickards' work, like the man himself, was essentially honest and essentially a protest.

STANLEY C. RAMSEY [F.].

SCULPTURE OF TO-DAY. By Kineton Parkes. *Volume I.: America, Great Britain, Japan. Volume II.: Continent of Europe.* 80, Lond. 1921. £1 5s. each volume. [Chapman and Hall, Ltd.]

Mr. Kineton Parkes has written a comprehensive review of modern sculpture, the first volume dealing with that of America, Great Britain, and Japan, and the second volume with that of the Continent of Europe.

The attempt to portray in a short essay the tendencies and aims of modern sculpture is a valiant one, and the measure of success will be the increased appreciation by the public of the best efforts of the sculptors. The education of the public is one of the aims of the critic, and by pointing out the qualities which the cultured taste of men of all ages has established as stable the critic is doing invaluable work.

The chief merit of any work of this nature is to be found in this direction; its influence on the public will in time react on the sculptor and tend to produce greater works of art. So far as this quality is concerned, the volumes under review are helpful, but only in a secondary way, the principal part being taken up with a series of biographical notices of modern sculptors, illustrated by several examples of their work. In addition, descriptive details are given of many works not illustrated; but these descriptions lack all enthu-

siasm of portrayal, and therefore leave the reader cold and unsympathetic to works which might in themselves have aroused appreciation and delight. The illustrations make the book popularly attractive, and this, perhaps, is one of the author's aims, and will help to awaken and foster public interest in a form of art which in England is rather neglected. This is all to the good, but a greater good might have been attained if the author had devoted more space to a critical analysis of the works selected for illustration and a restatement of the basic principles upon which all true art is founded.

The work covers a very wide range of modern sculpture, so wide that only a very superficial examination of its quality is possible, and for this survey the ordinary public should be grateful, as it may help them to go deeper into a matter which consciously or unconsciously influences their daily life.

Sculpture as it is applied to street architecture or to the decoration of cities in streets, squares, and gardens, is like architecture in this: it is always in evidence and cannot be ignored. Its effect, for good or ill, is always with us—pictures, books, and music, as a rule, we can escape at will, but these sculptures are factors in our daily development, and it is right that the qualities which are sound, stable, good, and beautiful should be pointed out for the benefit of the average observer, and his attention directed to the evanescent, false, and ugly which often appear in these works.

A habit of discrimination should be encouraged; comparative analysis should be insisted upon by the man in the street, and it should be the business of a writer of books of this nature to foster and encourage public development along these lines.

In these volumes there is perhaps too great a desire to provide a popular work, which is an easy thing to do, rather than to awaken the art student, the artist, and the public to the great underlying principles of all good art; but in so far as these volumes interest the worker and the public in sculpture they will be doing a necessary and beneficent work, and they are heartily welcome at this time, when the mind should be directed to the appreciation of beautiful things in contradistinction to the restless, unsettled and chaotic state from which the public at large now suffers.

J. S. GIBSON [F.].

THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

The President and Mr. Arthur Keen have been appointed to represent the Royal Institute on the Architectural Education Committee of the University of London.

SANITARY INSPECTORS' EXAMINATION BOARD.

Mr. H. D. Searles-Wood has been reappointed to represent the Institute on the Board.

Correspondence

UNIFICATION AND REGISTRATION.

4 Raymond Buildings, Gray's Inn, W.C.
26 December 1921.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—I find in your issue of 24 December another letter on Unification and Registration, in which we are told again that the Council of the R.I.B.A. approves of opening the doors of the Institute to "all architects of the United Kingdom," and the words are added: "without test or examination." The letter is signed by Mr. A. W. S. Cross and Mr. George Hubbard.

Leaving for the present the question whether anyone should publicly oppose the policy of the Council while holding the position of a Vice-President, I wish to point out once more that there is, and has been, no question of admitting any but qualified men. At the Council meeting on 23 May a report of nine printed pages, setting out Scheme A and Scheme B, was dealt with, and the following very brief resolution passed: "That the principle of Scheme A—namely, the bringing of all architects of the United Kingdom into membership of the R.I.B.A.—be adopted as the basis for Unification." (Scheme B was the Federation Scheme.) Scheme A refers throughout to "qualified" architects and to qualified architects only, and it provides for them to be placed in the class appropriate to their qualifications. Both signatories of the letter had this report, both of them understood the nature of the principle involved: is it "cricket" for them to endeavour to convey by means of the Press the impression that the R.I.B.A. proposes to admit without test or examination all who apply? The thing is, after all, almost too grotesque to be taken seriously. The writers of the letter know, and I now remind them of it, that it is proposed to set up a Board of Incorporation which shall be the sole judge of the qualifications of candidates. One welcomes sound criticism, but this criticism is neither sound nor ingenuous.

As for Registration, the writers of the letter are entitled to the opinions they hold on the probability of securing it, but they and all others may rest assured that we shall never get it unless we can go to Parliament with the solid backing of the whole profession.—Yours faithfully,

ARTHUR KEEN [F.],

Hon. Sec. Committee on Unification and Registration.

St. John's Wood, N.W.3.
27 December 1921.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—I sympathise somewhat with Mr. R. G. Wilson, though I do not agree with him. He repeats what, one would think, was the obvious interpretation of the

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

Unification Committee's proposal to bring "all architects of the United Kingdom into membership with the R.I.B.A." and says that any method short of absorbing the whole profession would be futile. He probably represents a considerable body of opinion in conflict with the desire of Mr. Keen and others to discriminate between the "properly qualified" and those who are not—which, as Mr. Perks points out in his clear, direct way, means an end of Unification (within the Institute), even if it were not already otherwise impossible. I cannot think why Mr. Wilson is silent as to the import of Mr. Keen's letter. We all enjoy, like him, the advantage of being older than we were, and those of us with ideas differing from his may conceivably be none the less sane. We can certainly claim the right to think that if Registration is ever going to be effected, and if its object is really to destroy the bad or incompetent architect, there are sounder and probably more ethically proper means for attempting to do so than some which are, we understand, now being considered.

The sacrificial argument always has a good sound, particularly if it is connected with the improvement of architecture. When sincerely meant it will, indeed, always be entitled to and will receive respect. Mr. Wilson must, however, forgive me if I ask him on what grounds he would—in order to advance architecture now or in the future—obtain, if he could, assistance from those who, in Mr. Keen's words, have never imposed on themselves the restraint necessary to a professional man or "taken much trouble to qualify themselves for a profession which is also an art"; and also why he so readily concludes that willingness to combine with and confer unearned distinctions upon these gentlemen, "for the good of the cause" (as he puts it), is likely to "redound to our credit." He may, despite his own attempt at a bargain, be able to explain this and reconcile it, moreover, with ordinary fair-play, to those who obtained their membership by the regular, recognised means, thinking the Institute was what it professed to stand for. And, perhaps, there is a side to the "esprit de corps" aspect of the case that Mr. Wilson has not thought of.

I would further, if I may, beg him and others to read carefully the letter appearing in the current JOURNAL signed by Mr. Cross and Mr. Hubbard,* whose knowledge of every phase of this question, and of architectural affairs generally, entitles them to speak with a good deal of authority. Those who do so will see quite another view presented, and one which frees the subject from many of the ambiguities recently obscuring it. Perhaps Mr. Wilson will particularly consider the public case for Registration and whether there is really any serious prospect of a Bill being ultimately passed, on the only grounds likely to be considered by Parliament—assuming, too, that the sacrifices he is so anx-

* This letter was received too late for publication.

ious about are made by those who, at the present moment, see no obvious reason for making them. Maybe some day we shall hear why the "Dental" precedent, of a Register following the passing of a Bill, was considered unsuitable, though, as Mr. Perks shows, definitely recommended to the Committee. I suspect it may not have been unconnected with our lack of a "public case." Others also may develop a suspicion, if not more, that the "good of architecture" claim, now proceeding often from quite unexpected quarters, rests on a shallow foundation—if, indeed, it has substance at all. We may well cry out with Goethe, "Whither we are going who can tell—who, indeed, can now remember whence he came?"

I dislike architectural politics intensely. When, however, a vital principle is being threatened affecting a body that, for nearly a century, has stood for the encouragement of what is best in architecture, a definite duty falls on its members to contend for what they believe to be right. For, as Mr. Perks quite aptly says, mere numbers do not necessarily give value or strength to an Institute such as ours, and, in the eyes of some, numbers seem to be the beginning and the end of Unification.

FREDK. R. HIORNS [F.].

1 Rutland Road, Hammersmith, W.

2 January 1922.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—There is a story of an advocate who addressed a magistrate for an hour, and then, thinking he had become inattentive, asked if his worship had been able to follow him so far. "Yes," was the weary reply; "but I should turn round now if I felt sure I could find my way back."

That may be the feeling of many architects. The Institute in past years was told authoritatively there was no hope for a Registration Act. The R.I.B.A. Constitution League, quite recently, sought the best advice, and again learnt the impossibility of getting a private Bill of this kind through Parliament, public interests being already well protected.

Unify qualified architects by all fair means, but why go on dreaming about registration?—Yours truly,

A. O. COLLARD [F.].

Highbury Park, N.

9 January 1922.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—As a member unaccustomed to take part in controversial matters, I have long wondered at the amount of energy and time dissipated over this Architects' Registration question. This view will probably be considered strange by the whole-hearted advocates of that policy, who seem to assume that all are in sympathy with the movement. To my knowledge this is not so. There are many members who, knowing full well that the chances of the attainment of Registration are practically nil, and content to take a neutral line

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

so long as membership of the Institute remains more or less unaffected, might not in all circumstances remain so quiescent.

What has recently transpired shows the probability of wholesale additions to the membership of the Institute, which might entirely change its character. There seems to be no good reason for this. If a form of Registration must be attempted, cannot it be done without spoiling the Institute and stimulating opposition from those who see little or no value in it?—Yours faithfully,

C. B. GORDON [A.].

THE R.I.B.A. AND ARCHITECTURE IN THE DOMINIONS.

2 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

31 December 1921.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—In the JOURNAL for 26 November 1921 Professor Percy E. Nobbs, writing from Canada, and Mr. Edward H. Waugh, from South Africa, contribute some observations on the relationship of the Institute to architects and architecture in the Dominions. It would be of further interest if similar contributions may be expected from Australia and New Zealand. Both Professor Nobbs and Mr. Waugh, although they write on the subject of "Dominion Branches," do not seem to be so much concerned about what may, perhaps, be called the political aspect of the relationship between the R.I.B.A. and its Allied Societies, or members, in the Dominions. Professor Nobbs speaks expressly of ethical standards and of a national tradition in design. Mr. Waugh, in courteous and kindly terms, reminds us, with no little truth, of our architectural insularity, and invites a wider outlook which shall see the Empire as a whole so far as the arts are concerned. One suggestion made by the latter might be acted on: it is that contributions to the JOURNAL should be made periodically by men in each of the Dominions who are willing to support a proposal of this kind. Such an arrangement would, if made, keep us more definitely in touch with Oversea thought on architectural matters. And, if a suggestion is permissible, we might hope for a note from Professor Nobbs on the subject of architectural education. He may be willing to approach it as a matter concerning the maintenance, propagation, or cultivation of a truly British national, perhaps Imperial, tradition of design rather than as an affair of a crammed, cramming, and indigestible curriculum. Professor Leslie Wilkinson might also let us hear his ideas on the same or a kindred subject from an Australian point of view. And in future a regular contribution could be looked for in the JOURNAL during each succeeding year.

Would it not also be possible for the R.I.B.A. to respond to the obvious invitation to us here that we could and should do more to keep ourselves in touch with the Dominions, and them with us, in those things by which

thought in architecture is expressed? It would surely be well if this might be done, not alone by theories, dogmas, of design expressed by verbs, but rather with an interchange of exhibits indicating results. For there seems no real reason why, now, a regular periodical exhibition of works in architecture and the allied arts should not be held, by some means of co-operation, both here and overseas. The Art and the Literature Standing Committees might, respectively, be able to consider these points.

It may be that a special issue of the JOURNAL once or twice in the Session, as an Empire Number, could be made one way of beginning to meet the evident desire for a wider outlook and a broader sympathy.—Faithfully yours,

HUBERT C. CORLETTE [F.].

ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION.

1 Woburn Square, W.C.1

20 December 1921.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—The meeting last Monday was so full of interesting discussion and lasted so long that I could not, in fairness to the audience, add my contribution. I shall be glad, therefore, if you will kindly allow me to say here how much I enjoyed Mr. Colcutt's paper and to give a few points that occurred to me. The suggestion of a probationary period was the most generally discussed, and I think the idea is excellent if it would work. How many of us F.R.I.B.A.'s would have been turned down under such a test? Certainly many of the best men I know were considered rather "duffers" because they developed slowly, and some of the most brilliant of my contemporaries have been utter failures. All the speakers last night seemed to take it for granted that a man had wasted so many precious years if he studied architecture and did not become an architect. I have had many students at the Central School of Arts and Crafts and a few private pupils who, although possessing unusual abilities, would never make architects, and it has given me the greatest pleasure to find out what these men could do best and yet make use of their early training. Our best mural painters, sculptors, furniture designers, carvers, metalworkers, plasterers, etc., are architects or they have studied architecture. This cannot be a coincidence. One of the greatest defects of our present training is the neglect of materials. I do not think it is possible to make a man an architect by teaching him to lay bricks, neither is it by teaching him to draw; but an intimate knowledge of stone, timber, and metals is essential to produce a living tradition that can grapple with new conditions. One remark of Mr. Colcutt's I do not agree with—the suggestion that a superficial knowledge of steel construction is enough. Steel and concrete are already the very bones in many cases, and no doubt this system will grow in the near future.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

We have so much to learn that we cannot hope to become expert designers in these materials, but we must know enough to tell the engineers what we want. Otherwise we must take what the expert gives us, and the work of two men out of sympathy cannot be a work of art.—Yours faithfully,

S. B. C. CAULFIELD [F.].

AMERICAN ARCHITECTURE.

*Wendover Road, Forest Hills Gardens,
Long Island, N.Y., U.S.A.*

14 December 1921.

To the Editor, JOURNAL R.I.B.A.,—

SIR,—Living near New York for over two years, may I add to Mr. H. Austen Hall's extremely interesting and instructive article in the JOURNAL for 26 November? The American Exhibition in London must have been of great interest to those who have never been here. "American architects are more successful in the handling of the larger problems of design than we in England," says Mr. Hall. He is right. Of this there is no question.

Compare the Pennsylvanian Railway Station and Boston Public Library (McKim, Mead and White) with several recent buildings within a short distance of Charing Cross. The comparison is very unfavourable to the work in London. Especially is this the case in regard to the detail. The station mentioned is an ideal conception of what a railway terminal ought to be. The same, however, cannot be said of the Grand Central Station. Although a masterpiece in planning, it cannot be compared with the former in regard to design. The Morgan Library is certainly a "gem," as Mr. Hall says, being perhaps the most perfect example in delicacy of detail of its kind, resembling the atmosphere of Chopin in a more solid form. The great care bestowed on the detail of many of the more notable public and semi-public buildings in this country is most marked. A careful note of these facts is well worth recording. I was particularly struck, when visiting the Boston Public Library, with the entasis on the columns of the arcade in the quadrangle. The proportions were perfect. Often with little or no ornament, and with great simplicity of detail, massive and imposing effects are produced in a manner almost unknown in England. Although the "loft" building or "skyscraper" may not create much feeling of restfulness or repose, the way in which many of these have been handled is very skilful, and one cannot help admiring the ingenuity and inventive faculties exercised in overcoming difficulties in their design and execution. Lord and Taylor's Store, Fifth Avenue, is a fine example of what a "department" store can be. What Mr. Hall says is again very true. Because a building is of large scale there is no reason why the detail should be coarse and unrefined. The detail of the stonework on the two lower floors of this building with balcony above would well repay a

visit to New York to anyone who contemplates the erection of a large structure of a similar nature in London or elsewhere. Many of the banks here would astonish most Britishers who have never seen an American banking institution—examples, again, of designs beautiful in detail and proportion. A notable addition to the Gothic style of architecture is to be found in New Haven, an old-fashioned university town.

The new Memorial Quadrangle at Yale University is a charming building, characterised by great skill in the handling of the stonework which is most effective. It is a fine example of modern Gothic. Generally speaking, however, not very much enthusiasm can be aroused for Gothic work here compared to English work of a similar nature. Of modern buildings in London the Roman Catholic Cathedral, Westminster, can worthily take its place with any building in America. Allow me again to endorse Mr. Hall's remarks when he refers to the "old Colonial style," in the development of which there is room for much scope, as evinced by numerous fine houses by Mr. Platt and others. The Southern Colonial style is especially charming, and numerous fine old examples still exist which can be adapted to the designs of the modern American house with delightful effect. Regarding domestic work, Mr. Hall again says that "England has long been supreme." Yes. The best types of modern domestic architecture in England still hold a unique position. There is a peculiar charm and fascination about the houses of Old England which has never been surpassed in any country. The Englishman still holds the field in domestic architecture.—Faithfully yours,

WILLIAM PATTERSON [L.].

THE EXHIBITION OF AMERICAN ARCHITECTURE.

The Council have accorded votes of thanks to the American Institute of Architects for the loan of the drawings and photographs, to the Exhibition Committee for their organising work, to the Hanging Subcommittee (Messrs. W. H. Ward, H. M. Fletcher and H. C. Bradshaw) for the effective arrangement of the exhibits, to Mr. H. C. Bradshaw for the design of the poster, and to Mr. Cart de Lafontaine for writing the Foreword to the Catalogue and for his services in negotiating the loan of the Exhibition.

INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL ADMINISTRATION.

A lecture will be given at the Great Hall of the London School of Economics on "Industrial Economics in relation to the bearing on National Welfare of the Ascertainment of Cost," by J. M. Fells, on Tuesday, 24 January. Sir William Pender will take the chair at 8 p.m. An invitation to attend the lecture is extended to members of the Institute.

Report on the Teaching of Construction

AT THE ÉCOLE NATIONALE ET SUPÉRIEURE DES BEAUX-ARTS

PRESENTED TO THE FRANCO-BRITISH ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS

GENTLEMEN,—The important schools of architecture aim at training students capable of conceiving and some day erecting beautiful and individual works of architecture.

The purpose of our meeting is to communicate to each other the efforts which our two countries have made towards this end, and to assist each other in this educative task. We cannot sufficiently congratulate the promoters of this *rapprochement*, which will assuredly be fruitful in results. You have kindly communicated to us the programmes of your principal English schools of architecture, and in them we have found many interesting ideas and methods of realising them.

I think it is quite in accordance with the spirit of our meeting to-day to describe to you the attempt which we have this year made at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris in the teaching of construction. But as this teaching is bound up with that of architectural composition, we must rapidly examine the operations which are required to enable us to create and erect a beautiful work of architecture which shall represent in the material sphere the true and realisable solution of a given programme.

What is the method followed at the École des Beaux-Arts for the attainment of this result?

Having thoroughly studied the programme, having mastered it, having examined not only the material conditions to which it is necessary to conform (the work must be adapted to its practical object), but also the theoretical conditions (the work must bear the character which is most perfectly appropriate); having classified the dominant, the secondary, and the accessory elements of the programme, the student, having thus grasped the true conception of the subject, finally takes up his pencil or charcoal.

By means of a number of sketches, mostly freehand work, which enable him more rapidly to embody his thoughts by making instinctive use of the interrelations between mind and senses, he endeavours to give form to his thoughts by appropriately suggestive lines, which he combines and proportions in conformity with the nature of the programme, and refines by successive tracings, striving to preserve in the entire work not only the character which he has conceived, but also a spirit of lucidity and unity.

He proceeds from the vague to the definite, from the general to the particular, from mass to detail, each point

to be solved at the proper time, each element of the programme placed with the emphasis and character suitable.

If his solution of the programme is true, and if the expression of it which he has found is correct and individual, he would obtain what we call a successful "parti."

This is, briefly, the work of composition as taught and practised in the ateliers of the school.

I do not think it is possible to improve on this method of teaching. It is for the student to turn it to the best account.

Its great superiority over the systems practised in other French or foreign schools is due to:—

1. The fact that it conforms to the law of all creative work.
2. The value of the teaching of professors and patrons of the ateliers, who are all masters of their art.
3. The advice and criticism of senior students, whom the juniors watch at work.
4. The rivalry between ateliers, which always stimulates effort towards improvement.
5. Finally, that atmosphere of artistic probity, impartial discussion, zeal, and mutual help, which prevails in the ateliers, and owing to which, in any competition, students take an interest in the design of their competitors and endeavour to impress an individual character on their own work.

But, however successful the solution of the programme may be in itself, it is of no use unless it is capable of execution, and unless its mode of construction also expresses truth.

The student must therefore know the materials which can be employed in the building, so as to choose them judiciously in conformity with the spirit of the programme; he must know the method of construction in use, the calculations of stresses; and, besides, he must know how to arrange methodically the numerous technical plants which were unknown in the past, which are required by modern practice, and which virtually transform certain portions of present-day buildings into small engineering centres.

A knowledge of science, no less than of art, is a necessity for the architect. If he knows little or nothing about it, his scope of expression must be considerably restricted. Schools must therefore train their students from the scientific as well as from the artistic point of view.

But whatever methods of construction may yet be discovered, however important may be the new services or devices required in future buildings, the school must never forget that art alone can create, whereas science is merely a means of control.

Even in the domain of science, when a master creates, it is his imagination—that is to say, the artist in him—which guides him. Having made his discovery, he will

then put it to a scientific test in order to ascertain whether or no it will live ; but his calculations must be based on something tangible, which belongs to the domain of creative art.

Every architect, therefore, must be an artist and a scientist.

But since his work must be capable of actual construction, his scientific knowledge must be applied even during the period of composition, although this belongs to the domain of pure art.

But in what manner must his scientific knowledge be applied ?

It is essential to define it here, because many schools are still in error, and can never produce students capable of achieving success.

During the period of composition the scientist must remain in the background, and yet always within reach of the artist, to remind him of material possibilities. The scientist must not at every moment wish to control what proceeds from the artist's brain : by so doing he would quickly clip the wings of inspiration. Above all, he must not take the lead : that would be disastrous. The mind of the artist must move in the realm of construction ; but in order to create, he must jealously preserve his liberty in combining units, placing them in proportion to their value, and seeking the most characteristic expression of the idea, without every moment looking to see whether what he is doing will or will not have to be modified by calculation. The scientist must for the moment only supply the instinctive selection of those forms which are capable of realisation with the materials available, and this until the solution of the problem is found. Only then will the scientist resume control with all mathematical checks. And if he has rightly exercised his rôle of informing the artist, without disturbing him, during the creative phase, the final result will not be modified by such control.

This solution, checked and drawn in detail, must, with a view to execution, be completed by means of specifications, priced quantities, estimates of cost, and tenders. Afterwards comes the realisation : execution of works, checking and settlement of accounts, etc., all these things being within the realm of experience and professional practice.

These are, in fact, the operations which the architect must follow methodically from the moment when he acquaints himself with the programme until the time when the work is completed.

We see his knowledge of construction brought into play :

1. At the outset, in the shape of instinctive guidance, during composition.
2. After the " Parti " has been settled, in the shape of scientific control.
3. From that moment up to the end, in the shape of practice and experience.

Is it possible in a school to impart all this knowledge, necessary as it is, and require of the student that he shall be master of it at the time of examination ? Assuredly not.

Time would not suffice, nor could the brain of the student grasp it all. To overload the student's memory will defeat its own object. Rather, his scientific and practical mind must be trained, just as his artistic mind is trained ; he must learn how to set out the conditions of a constructional problem, and how, by applying the principles governing any question, that question may be solved. By means of numerous illustrations he must be interested in matters of construction, endowed with the sense of construction, and supplied with numerous examples to guide him in his career. He should be made as capable of creation in the realm of science as he is in that of art, in order that he may overcome difficulties in his career by reference to his lectures, with the support of mature judgment and common sense.

The task is difficult, and the Franco-British Union of Architects must make it easier for us by communicating experiments which each of us can attempt in this direction.

Let us observe, in the first place, that the teaching of construction is based in equal parts on imagination, reinforced by practical and scientific knowledge, and on purely mathematical calculation which can only be applied to the product of imagination.

The École des Beaux-Arts has long since entrusted the teaching of this second section, which includes stresses and strains, to a fully qualified professor ; just as it has entrusted to specialists the teaching of mathematics, descriptive geometry, perspective, physics and chemistry, geology, etc., all subjects necessary to a proper scientific training.

There remains the teaching of practical construction. This may be divided into two parts :—

Before making the student acquainted with the use of materials according to recognised rules, and with the solution of the various structural problems which may arise, he ought to be made familiar with the nature, the qualities, and the defects of all the materials which he will have to use ; he must also be taught the recognised methods of jointing wood, iron and stone, comprised in the study of stereotomy ; and again he must learn the nature of such materials as plaster, lime, cement and the like, and the composition of mortars and concretes.

At the École des Beaux-Arts it is the Professor of Stereotomy who has charge of the first part of such teaching.

Being thus prepared by the various courses above referred to, and having passed all the requisite examinations, the student is admitted to the course which at the École des Beaux-Arts is called the construction course.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

It was during the delivery of this course that the experiment was made which I now beg to bring under your notice, and of which I had the honour to describe the principles to several of our English colleagues at the time of their last visit to Paris.

The object is to instruct the student without drudgery in all the parts of a building, all the ever-multiplying processes of construction : to set before him numerous practical examples, calculated to awaken his mind to structural matters and to imbue him with a sense of structure ; finally, to show him how work is executed, without the need of group visits to buildings in progress, visits which are difficult to arrange and often involve a disproportionate waste of time. This purpose dictated, more or less, the following method of instruction :—

1. The slow and often soporific dictation of the professor is exchanged for the rapid stimulating delivery of the lecturer.
2. Instead of diagrams slowly drawn on the blackboard by the professor, lantern slides are exhibited, so that in a course of forty lectures some 6,000 or 7,000 diagrams are shown and commented upon, instead of 400 or 500, and this without exhausting the student, who, having no notes to take, can devote all his attention to the subject under discussion.
3. The student is not obliged to take notes, but the whole of the lectures (both texts and diagrams) are printed for him to study at his leisure.
4. The student is required to devote a note-book to special sketches, kept up to date between the lectures.
5. At the oral examination he is only examined on a list of questions designated beforehand and dealing with fundamental principles.
6. He is required to produce a final design showing the application of his knowledge of construction.

In order that the course may be interesting and practical, all the known processes of construction and all the problems which may be met with in the erection of a building are dealt with in the exact sequence in which they occur during execution, from excavations and foundations to final completion, including painting and decoration.

Thus the student sees the continuous growth of the building, and can rapidly find in the printed lectures the answer to any question which may arise.

Generally speaking, when dealing with a definite subject, and whenever it is possible to do so, the construction problem is first set, together with all the conditions to which it must answer ; the theory of the various possibilities of such a problem is next laid down ; then the geometric drawings which are to solve the problem are thrown on the screen, with views of works either in course of execution or already completed.

In recapitulating the course of lectures a general survey is made of the methods used on a large building,

always observing the same sequence—the study of the programme, lantern slides of the geometric drawings which form its solution, and some 150 or 180 pictures covering the whole work from foundations to roof-tree.

The course of lectures also contains a quantity of supplementary information which is only touched on in the lecture room.

To enable the pupil to find his way amongst a rather voluminous set of papers, and in order that his attention may not be distracted from essential questions, he is at the very outset given a set of 90 questions which will be asked at the time of the examination, and each one of these questions is accompanied by the relative text and sketches which alone will have to be reproduced on the blackboard.

I must add that the printed course also contains rather elaborate information as to how to draw up specifications, bills of quantities, estimates, tenders, as well as how the work should be conducted, settlement of accounts, and architect's book-keeping. This part of the course, however, is not called for in the examination; for the time being at least it is but the embodiment of general information, with examples which will be invaluable for the student in the exercise of his profession.

The object of the book of sketches which the student will have to produce at the time of his examination (which sketches cover the various component parts of a building and connect the subjects specifically treated with the other constructional subjects) is to teach him how to express his thoughts in plan, section, elevation, or perspective (a language which he will have to use all through his professional life). And we also aim at teaching him better those fundamental questions which will be the subject matter of his final examination.

In order to obtain an honourable mention in construction and to pass from the Second to the First Class, the pupil, after successfully passing his oral examination, must further produce an important constructional design, demanding two and a half months of assiduous work. This is the crowning point of this course of instruction, showing the application of the student's technical and scientific knowledge to a large architectural scheme.

The author of an unsatisfactory design is relegated for another year.

Such, gentlemen, is the new *régime* which has been put to the test this year at the *École des Beaux-Arts* in connection with the teaching of construction.

It would be interesting to show you the results we have obtained, but after only one year of actual practice it would be imprudent to formulate a definite opinion. I must say, however, that I have been particularly and agreeably surprised at the interest shown by the pupils in matters of construction, at the remarkable work done by them, and at their success in the examinations.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

The final design—a large swimming pool with restaurant—led to really interesting and very variously treated constructional solutions, in which the pupils suggested, for the main work, the alternate use of steel, reinforced concrete, and masonry vaults. The details were quite appropriate to the subject.

These good results this year are attributable to the interest and earnestness of the students, due, no doubt, to the novelty of the subject, which is always attractive. Not for some years can we be sure of the actual results of this method of teaching. Whatever these may be, allow me to conclude by giving you my personal opinion.

Although science and constructional experience may be factors in the successful career of an architect, these should not be made the predominant object of the teaching in a school of architecture which aims at artistic distinction in its students.

The real quality and the superiority of the architect, howsoever great his attainments in construction, will always arise from his creative skill in architectural composition. It is in this direction that the greatest efforts should always be applied.

EDOUARD ARNAUD,
*Professor at the Central School of
Arts and Manufactures and at the
National and Higher School of Fine
Arts.*

BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION.

STUDENTS' EVENING AT THE EXHIBITION OF PRIZE DRAWINGS.

The Board of Architectural Education have arranged to hold a special Students' Evening in connection with the Exhibition of Prize Drawings in the Galleries of the Royal Institute, on Wednesday, 25 January, at 8 p.m.

Students from the Architectural Schools and others are cordially invited to attend, and several professors and teachers will be present who will give information quite informally on different points of interest. No cards of admission are required. Light refreshments will be provided.

NEW "RECOGNISED SCHOOL."

On the recommendation of the Board of Architectural Education, the Degree Course of the Armstrong College, Newcastle, has been recognised, on the usual terms, as exempting from the R.I.B.A. Intermediate Examination.

ROYAL BRITISH COLONIAL SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS.

Mr. W. E. Riley [*F.*] has been appointed by the Council as representative of the Institute in connection with the Royal British Colonial Society of Architects—not on the Council of that body, as stated in the last number of the JOURNAL.

THE R.A. SCHOOLS GOLD MEDALLIST.

Mr. Cyril A. Farey [*A.*], who has been awarded the 1921 Royal Academy Schools Gold Medal and Edward Stott Travelling Studentship of the Royal Academy, has thus crowned a career of distinguished studentship, apart from a successful practice as an architect.

Born in 1888, Mr. Farey was educated at Tonbridge School. His early training as an architect was obtained at the A.A. Schools and at the School of the Royal Academy. He was articled to Mr. Horace Field, and was afterwards assistant to Mr. Ernest Newton, R.A. He visited Italy four times between the years 1910 and 1920 in pursuit of his studies.

In students' competitions Mr. Farey has gained the following awards: Travelling Studentship, A.A. Schools, 4th year (1909); R.I.B.A. Measured Drawings, Hon. Men. (Hôtel Carnavalet) (1910); Royal Academy Schools Bronze Medal (1911); R.I.B.A. Tite Prize (1913); Soane Medallion (1914); R.A. Schools Gold Medal and Edward Stott Travelling Studentship (1921).

During the war Mr. Farey served for four years in the Army, and was demobilised in 1919 with the rank of Captain.

In open competitions Mr. Farey gained (in conjunction with Mr. Horace Field) the first premium in the Trevor Estate, Knightsbridge, Competition (1911); second premium in the *Country Life* Cottage Competition (1912), and also second premium in the same periodical's House Competition (1913); the first premium for the Civic Arts War Memorial Competition (1916); Bristol Housing, premiated and appointed one of the architects to design and carry out the scheme (1919); Leeds Departmental Store (second premium), 1920 (in conjunction with Mr. R. Frank Atkinson [*F.*]).

STREET ARCHITECTURE AWARD.

The following have been appointed by the Council to serve on the Jury which is to make the Annual Award for the best street frontage completed in London:—

Sir Aston Webb, President of the Royal Academy.

Mr. Paul Waterhouse, President of the R.I.B.A.

Sir Reginald Blomfield, R.A., Past President of the R.I.B.A.

Mr. E. Guy Dawber, Vice-President of the R.I.B.A.

The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, K.T., etc., Hon. Fellow of the R.I.B.A.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO SCIENTIFIC ORGANISATIONS.

The Council have voted subscriptions to the funds of the Empire Forestry Association and the British Engineering Standards Association.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

HIGHER BUILDINGS FOR LONDON.

The Council of the Institute have discussed the report of a Committee which has suggested the modification of the London County Council's Regulations so as to permit the erection of higher buildings in London.

After careful consideration of the whole subject the Council have arrived at the following conclusions :—

That any general increase in the height of buildings would be detrimental to the amenities of London.

That the powers possessed by the County Council of permitting an increase of height in particular cases are adequate and are exercised in a reasonable way.

That the open spaces and wide streets of London are of great value in securing the free circulation of air, and that their usefulness in this respect should not be impaired by permitting the erection of high buildings adjoining them.

That the principle of increasing housing accommodation by means of high buildings is a reactionary one, and undesirable from the point of view of family life.

That in the case of buildings which, in order to secure unity of design, are required to be of the height allowed by the Building Act the restriction of the height of the top floor to 60 feet in those of large cubical contents is no longer necessary or desirable in view of the methods of construction and fire attack now available.

R.I.B.A. CONFERENCE AT CARDIFF.

The Annual Provincial Conference of the Royal Institute of British Architects will be held on 9 and 10 June 1922 at Cardiff. The organisation of the Conference has been undertaken by the South Wales Institute of Architects, an Allied Society of the R.I.B.A.

Members are particularly requested to bear these dates in mind, and to endeavour to keep them free from other engagements so that they may be able to attend the Conference.

"THE DESIGNERS OF OUR BUILDINGS."

The Council have accorded a vote of thanks to Mr. L. Cope Cornford, the author of the recently published volume on the Royal Institute and its activities.

IRON PORTLAND CEMENT.

Mr. Richard B. Ling [A.] writes to ask if any member of the Institute in the Rotherham district can supply any further information on the following note :

"When passing through Rotherham, near Sheffield, in 1907, my attention was called to a small grinding plant by the side of a large disused slag tip close to the Parkgate Steel Works, and I was informed that a German firm had bought the slag at a small price and intended erecting a plant for the manufacture of Portland cement from this waste material, the grinding being the first part of the process."

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.

The following circular letter from a business firm having been brought to the attention of the Practice Committee, the Secretary of the Institute, on the Committee's recommendation, has communicated with the firm (whose name we withhold) as below :—

13 December 1921.

DEAR SIR,—I enclose a copy of a circular which has been sent out by your firm to architects. One of these circulars was received by a member of this Institute who has called out attention to it.

The circular was submitted to the Practice Standing Committee, and they have directed me to point out to you that the wording of the document is most undesirable, as it appears to suggest that architects should give work to the Company in the expectation of themselves being employed by the Company.

You are probably unaware that this is a proposal which no reputable architect would consider for a moment, it being entirely contrary to the code of professional conduct which members of this Institute make it a point of honour to observe.

Faithfully yours,

IAN MacALISTER

Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN OF STRUCTURES.

DEAR SIR,—Owing to the increasing demand of our numerous clients, both at home and abroad, who want architectural treatment of various structures entrusted to us, we shall be glad to know your scale of fees, if you are willing to undertake such work.

Most of the structures designed by us, in order to be economical, efficient and permanent, are in reinforced concrete, although we do a large amount of structural steel designing. Reinforced concrete has been found to be most adaptable to architectural treatment.

On behalf of our clients, we decide on the best architectural design either by competition or direct appointment of a reliable architect known to us.

On the basis of mutual co-operation, could we also expect an opportunity of submitting our free design of the *structural* part of your client's proposed building or other structures? We shall be glad to help you in deciding for your client the most suitable and economical structure, either in reinforced concrete or steel. We are in a position to undertake the complete erection, and as such will supply you with estimate of cost and tender.

You need only send us your plans and full requirements, and we will do the rest.

Among the various structures now in erection, we may mention here the large construction works . . . being carried out in the *exclusive design* of our Director. For this work we required the assistance of many architects, with whom we do mutual business as outlined above.—Assuring you of our best attention, we remain,

Yours faithfully,

LONDON BUILDING ACTS COMMITTEE.

On the recommendation of the Practice Standing Committee the Council have decided that the question of higher buildings for London should be made the subject of discussion at a General Meeting.

Architect's Liability and Insurance

The following communication has been received from Mr. Leonard Lait :—

Will you allow me, through the medium of the JOURNAL, to bring to the notice of members of the R.I.B.A. a scheme for the protection (by insurance) of architects against "Professional Liability" claims?

The scheme to which I refer is in no way "official," but members of the Practice Committee and other Standing Committees have been consulted, with a view to ensuring that it shall fully meet the requirements of members of the R.I.B.A. It was formulated several months ago, but was not put forward publicly at the time, as it was understood that proposals for dealing with this question by means of a "Defence Union," to be formed under the auspices of the R.I.B.A., were under consideration, and it was not desired to compete with any such official organisation.

I now understand, however, that no action on these lines is to be taken; and it will therefore be of interest to members of the R.I.B.A. to know that an alternative means of protection is available.

The risk against which protection is offered is principally that of a claim being brought against an architect by a dissatisfied client, owing to real or imaginary non-compliance with his instructions; or the development of defects in a completed building (for example, the appearance of dry-rot through the inadvertent use of infected timber, or the cracking of faience or decorative work through settlement of an addition to an old building), or damage to contents through alleged defective ventilation; in short, on any grounds on which an allegation of "neglect, default or error" might be founded.

Such cases, although comparatively infrequent, are apparently less so than is generally supposed (owing doubtless to the natural reluctance of the architect whose professional skill is impugned to ventilate the dispute publicly), and when they occur are apt to bear very heavily upon the victim, who must either pay up in silence or incur heavy expense in fighting (even if he wins) his case; in either event, he sustains a very severe loss.

The risk is, in fact, analogous to that of the destruction of one's house by fire; which risk is in the case of any given individual extremely remote, but which is so disastrous to the one on whom it falls, unless he is protected by insurance, that no one, for the sake of saving a small premium, would willingly take it upon himself.

Arrangements have been concluded with a leading syndicate of Lloyd's underwriters for the issue of a policy, to be known as the "Architect's Indemnity Policy," completely indemnifying the holder against "any claim which may arise from any act of neglect, default or error" on his part, including all expenses and legal charges arising therefrom; but it is provided that the assured shall in no case be compelled to contest any claim at law without his own consent, and this provision in no way affects his right of recovery from the underwriters.

The undertaking to issue this policy is conditional upon the production of evidence that the scheme would be likely to receive sufficient support to put it on a sound basis; and it is in order to ascertain whether such support would be forthcoming that I venture to ask for the publication of this letter.

To return to the analogy of fire insurance, no fire ever occurs that cannot be ascribed to "negligence" on the part of someone, but few would be so confident of their own ability to avoid such "negligence" as to forgo the safeguard of insurance.

Members of the Institute who are interested in this question should communicate with Mr. Leonard Lait at 3 Tokenhouse Buildings, King's Arms Yard, London, E.C.

Allied Societies

SHEFFIELD, SOUTH YORKSHIRE AND DISTRICT SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS AND SURVEYORS.

Mr. C. B. Flockton [F.], in his presidential address at the opening meeting of the session of the Sheffield, South Yorkshire and District Society of Architects and Surveyors on 21 December, said :—

I shall refer to unemployment in the building and its allied trades principally. There is no doubt that unemployment at the present moment is a very grave trouble; but, like all the troubles of mankind, it is mostly of man's own making; and if man's trouble is of his own making, it may be properly assumed that its cure lies mostly in his own hands. An Act of Parliament is quite useless as a cure. It may alleviate, but it will never cure. In my opinion, the present unemployment in the building trade has mainly arisen because for some time past the trade has not given value for money received; and I am equally of opinion that unemployment will be reduced to a minimum as soon as all parties give value for money received, and not till then. It is customary to throw all the blame on the workman. This is untrue. I say all parties must give value for money received—the contractor, the manufacturer, the merchant, the skilled workman, the labourer. The three first named must be content with reasonable profit. I fully realise that times have been difficult. The unstable state of the market for materials and labour, the interference of politicians who cannot govern, but who will meddle, and other uncertain factors made it necessary for a contractor to cover himself against circumstances out of his control; but it ought now to be possible to remove most of these uncertainties and return to more normal conditions. If trade is to revive, builders must look for their profits from what they can save rather than from what they can make.

What is to be the workman's share in the revival? The first essential is that a serious and determined effort shall be made to counteract the pernicious doctrine that limiting output increases employment. The second essential is that workmen shall give value for wages received. It is customary to cry "Wages must come down!" "Wages must come down!" Why must they? If you say wages must come down or production must go up, I agree most fully; but the point I want to press most strongly upon both employer and employed is that if production or output, call it what you will, goes up to the present level of wages, there would be no need for wages to come down to the present level of output. If everybody doubled his output, the cost of everything would drop one-half, and everybody would be twice as well off, because the money he earned would buy twice as much.

There need be no fear of mopping up all the work in the building trade. Of my own certain knowledge, I can say that two years ago there were scores of thousands of pounds worth of building work ripe and ready for commencing. In many instances the working drawings were made; in some the quantities were got out ready for tendering. If that work had gone on, the trade in Sheffield would have been fully employed to-day and for many months to come, and so would the allied trades. All was stopped. Why? First, because of the instability and uncertainty of cost. Contracts for a fixed sum could not be obtained. Secondly, to the unsettled state of labour, which made it impossible to fix a time for completion. Consequently the building owner could not ascertain the expenditure to which he was committed, or how long his premises would be upset and his business crippled and inconvenienced by building operations. To-day the city is full of work, only waiting for reasonably stable prices and stable conditions of labour to be put in hand.

Waste, particularly municipal waste, is detrimental to our profession, and tends to produce unemployment in the building trades. High rates make it impossible to erect buildings to let at

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

an economic rent, and they certainly deter occupying owners from enlarging and improving their premises, as they otherwise would do. The development of the city is obstructed, and the enlargement of the rateable value is stopped. Economy does not solely consist in the avoidance of expenditure; it equally lies in the expenditure of money wisely and profitably. A considerable amount of municipal expenditure must necessarily be directly unproductive; but if care and thought are exercised, much of the unproductive expenditure may be made to be very profitable indirectly. The great aim and object of a municipality should be to assist and encourage the increase of rateable value in every way it can, because that is the best way to bring the rates down; and the greatest care should be taken to avoid any scheme which tends to obstruct the development of rateable value or to reduce it.

THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF THE ARCHITECTS OF IRELAND.

At the annual general meeting of the Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland, held at Dublin, on 15 December 1921—the President, Mr. Lucius O'Callaghan, F.R.I.A.I., referred to the recent death of the oldest member of the Institute, Mr. George C. Ashlin.

The Hon. Secretary (Mr. H. Allberry, F.R.I.A.I.) read the report of the Council for the past session, from which the following extracts are taken :—

Registration.

"Probably the subject of the greatest importance to the architectural profession which the British Institute have at present under consideration is that of unification and registration, and your President was again nominated to the Unification Committee, which on 12 May passed the following resolutions :—
"That the principle of bringing all the architects of the United Kingdom into membership of the Royal Institute of British Architects be adopted as the basis for unification."

"That the committee recommend the Royal Institute to draft such alterations to its Charter and by-laws as may be necessary to comply with this principle, and to confer with the Council of the Society of Architects as to conditions of membership."

"These resolutions were adopted by the Council of the British Institute, and the outlines of an agreement between that body and the Society of Architects have been drafted for consideration, and at present lie with the respective Councils. Your Council have hitherto refrained from expressing any views on the proposals generally pending receipt and consideration of the draft scheme, as they are of opinion that it would be undesirable to bind this Institute to any defined policy during the present period of flux."

Education.

The report states that in April last a committee was appointed to inquire into the facilities existing for the education of students of architecture, and to prepare a report with recommendations as to methods which may be considered necessary for improving the present condition of architectural education in this country. The report of this committee was submitted to the Council in September, and, with some slight amendments, circulated to all members of the Institute in October.

"At the general meeting in November the report was discussed, and the following resolution was unanimously passed :—
"That this meeting desires to thank the committee for having prepared such a valuable report, and considers that, as the question of architectural education is one of the greatest importance to the profession and the public, the Council should proceed immediately on the lines indicated in the report."

Advertisements and Sky-signs.

"The attention of the Council having been called to the possibility that advertisements would be placed upon the Loop

Line Bridge, the matter was referred to the Arts Committee, which reported as follows :—

"The Committee are of opinion that the Council should memorialise the Corporation of the city of Dublin, the Dublin and South-Eastern Railway Company, and other bodies holding authority in the matter, with a view of preventing the bridge being used for the purpose of advertisements."

"If the erection of advertisements be permitted, the result must be the accentuation of an eyesore, and the underlining of an act of vandalism in the past."

"The Committee welcomed the action of the Corporation in obtaining power under the Dublin Reconstruction Act to control the erection of sky-signs and advertisements on new buildings in the destroyed area, an action which leads the Committee to hope that the Corporation will take steps to prevent the vulgarisation of the Loop Line Bridge, or any other railway bridge in Dublin, by the erection of advertisements thereon."

Ulster Parliament.

With reference to the Treasury's action in connection with the designs for the proposed Parliament buildings for Northern Ireland, the report says :—

"Your Council regret that the subject was not brought to their knowledge at an earlier date, so that some effective action could have been taken in a matter of such great importance to the Irish architectural profession. An extraordinary feature presents itself throughout the whole of the proceedings—viz., that although the Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland functions for the whole of Ireland, and might be presumed to be in a position to offer the soundest advice on the most efficient means of obtaining designs for these public buildings, neither the First Commissioner nor the Council of the Royal Institute of British Architects made the slightest effort to ascertain their considered views on the subject."

In conclusion reference is made to the compulsory retirement of Mr. Sheridan, hon. treasurer, to the appointment of Mr. Allberry as Deputy Principal Architect to the Office of Works, Ireland, and to the election of Mr. G. F. Beckett and Mr. S. M. Ashlin as hon. secretary and hon. treasurer for the next three years.

Architects' Benevolent Society.

The President, in moving the adoption of the report, called particular attention to the assistance that had recently been given to cases of distress by the Architects' Benevolent Society, and impressed upon the members the need for supporting this useful organisation.

The report was unanimously adopted.

The Institute Bye-Laws

Amendments approved by the Privy Council.

Notice has been received from the Privy Council as follows :—

AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, WHITEHALL,

THE 13TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1921.

BY THE LORDS OF HIS MAJESTY'S MOST HONOURABLE PRIVY COUNCIL.

WHEREAS there was this day read at the Board a letter dated the 23rd November, 1921, from Messrs. Markby Stewart and Company transmitting certain Resolutions varying Bye-laws Nos. 4, 63, and rescinding Bye-law No. 16 of the Royal Institute of British Architects passed at a Special General Meeting of the said Institute held on the 7th day of November, 1921, and confirmed at a subsequent Special General Meeting of the said Institute held on the 21st day of November, 1921 :

And whereas by Article 33 of the Charter of Incorporation

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

of the said Institute it is provided that no Bye-laws shall be of any force or validity whatever unless and until they have been approved by the Lords of the Council :

Now, THEREFORE, Their Lordships, having taken the amendments of the said Bye-laws into consideration, are pleased to allow the same as set forth in the Schedule to this Order.

Almeric Fitz-Roy.

SCHEDULE.

AMENDMENTS OF THE BYE-LAWS OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS.

Bye-law 4.—To be amended by the addition of the following words "The number of members in the Class of Honorary Associates must not exceed sixty."

Bye-law 16.—To be rescinded.

Bye-law 63.—To be amended by the addition of the following words: "or in the election of the Council and Standing Committees."

Bye-law No. 4 will therefore now read as follows :—

4. Every nomination of a candidate as Honorary Associate must state his Christian name, surname, and place of residence, and must be subscribed by him and by at least three Fellows who shall certify their personal knowledge of him. *The number of members in the Class of Honorary Associates must not exceed sixty.*

Bye-law No. 16 now rescinded :—

Any Fellow who has retired from practice may, on his request, by Resolution of the Council, be transferred without election or entrance contribution to the Class of Honorary Associates. In the Register of Honorary Associates the names of such transferred Fellows shall be printed in italics.

Bye-law No. 63 will now read as follows :—

63. No Honorary Associate shall be entitled to vote in the election of any candidate for admission to the Royal Institute, or on any professional question, *or in the election of the Council and Standing Committees.*

The additions to the amended Bye-laws Nos. 4 and 63 are printed in italics.

Competitions

AUCKLAND WAR MEMORIAL COMPETITION.

The following cablegram has been received by the Secretary of the R.I.B.A. from the Mayor of Auckland :
"Letter November Fourteen received. Advise Competitors wait answers numerous questions in mail due London end of month.—MAYOR."

THE TOTTENHAM WAR MEMORIAL COMPETITION.

The Council endorsed the issue of the veto in regard to this competition.

IN NEGOTIATION.

MALVERN PUBLIC BATHS COMPETITION AND

TRURO WAR MEMORIAL COMPETITION.

The Competitions Committee desire to call the attention of Members and Licentiates to the fact that the

conditions of the above competitions are unsatisfactory. The Competitions Committee are in negotiation with the promoters in the hope of securing an amendment. In the meantime Members and Licentiates are advised to take no part in these competitions.

The Competitions Committee are also in negotiation with the promoters of the following competitions :—
Seaford Recreation Ground, Dundee War Memorial, and Kirkwall War Memorial.

COMPETITIONS OPEN.

Auckland War Memorial.

Kirkcaldy War Memorial.

The conditions and other documents relating to the above competitions may be consulted in the Library.

Examinations

FINAL AND SPECIAL WAR EXAMINATIONS.

ALTERNATIVE PROBLEMS IN DESIGN.

The Board of Architectural Education announce that the designs submitted by the following students who are qualifying for the Final and Special War Examinations have been approved :—

Subject LIX.

(A) *Design for a City Square with Colonnade.*

Clark : R. J. B.	Jenson : A. G.
King : W.	Knewstubb : F. W.
Reid : A. S.	Ryle : W. (Miss)
Sugden : H. D.	

Designs for various other subjects submitted by the following students have also been approved :—

Burge : B.	Conlan : J. N. P.
Dent : A. R.	Hutton : C. H.
Reid : A. S.	Shroff : L. F.

THE SPECIAL WAR EXAMINATION.

The Special War Examination (for Students whose studies had been interrupted by the war) was held in London and Liverpool from 12 to 16 December 1921. Of the 144 candidates admitted 106 passed and 38 were relegated.

The successful candidates are as follows :—

ALLEN : JOSEPH STANLEY, 38 Grange Road West, Birkenhead.
ALLISON : FREDERICK WILLIAM HARFORTH, 11 Lynton Gardens, Harrogate.
ALLSFORD : ERNEST HAROLD, 56 Ovington Street, Chelsea, S.W.
ANDREWS : CYRIL DOUGLAS, 222 High Street, Ponders End, Middlesex.
BARNARD : HAROLD THOMAS BENJAMIN, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.
BARTLETT : PERCY JAMES, 3 Mead Way, Sea Mills Park, Bristol.
BEASLEY : ALBERT, 1 Sandringham Road, Sneinton, Nottingham.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

- BEAUMONT : EUGENE EDWARD, 18 Manor Road, Sidcup.
 BECK : HENRY BERKELEY, 5 Meyrick Road, Stafford.
 BLOOMFIELD : EDWARD HAMILTON, 50 Tantallon Road, Balham, S.W.
 BLOOMFIELD : HENRY LANCELOT, 11 Rothesay Road, Luton.
 BOWRING : JOHN VALENTINE, 193A Broadway, Southend-on-Sea.
 BRANSON : PERCY KENNETH, 123 St. Saviour's Road, Leicester.
 BROOKS : LESLIE CLIFFORD, 297 Broad Street, Birmingham.
 BROWN : FRANK COLLIN, 14 Dartmouth Park Road, N.W.5.
 BROWN : GEORGE TALBOT, 51 Fawcett Street, Sunderland.
 BUMPSTEAD : ALBERT DENNIS, 7c Heath Gardens, Twickenham.
 BURNETT : EDGAR, Weir House, Hickling, Melton Mowbray.
 BURNETT : FREDERICK WANDLASS, 23 Windsor Terrace, Penarth, Glamorgan.
 BYROM : RICHARD, 221 Tottington Road, Elton, Bury, Lancs.
 CARTER : WILLIAM, 5 Murton Street, Sunderland.
 CHALLICE : JOHN, 25 Pennsylvania Road, Exeter.
 CHECKLEY : GEORGE, 23 Parkbridge Road, Prenton, Cheshire.
 CHEEK : ALFRED CYRIL, c/o Messrs. Seale and Riley, 25 Horsefair Street, Leicester.
 CLARK : HAROLD GOUNDRY, 35 Dartmouth Park Road, N.W.5.
 CLARK : SIDNEY CHARLES, 3 Ronald Park Avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.
 COGSWELL : VICTOR GORDON, "Sunnicate," London Road, North End, Portsmouth.
 COLE : ERIC, 31 Promenade, Cheltenham.
 COOK : HERBERT JAMES, School House, Ryhope, Sunderland.
 CORDINGLEY : REGINALD ANNANDALE, 11 Irlam Road, Sale, Cheshire.
 COTTON : GILBERT HENRY, 60 Regent's Park Road, N.W.1.
 COUCHMAN : HAROLD WILLIAM, Mount Pleasant House, Tottenham, N.
 COWTAN : ALBERT CHARLES, "Elm Way," Eastfields Road, Acton, W.3.
 CREEGAN : EDGAR WILSON, 23A Golders Way, Golders Green, N.W.11.
 DAVIES : HAROLD HINCHCLIFFE, 14 North John Street, Liverpool.
 DETMOLD : FREDERICK GUY, 100 Redcliff Gardens, S.W.10.
 EDWARDS : WILFRID BYTHELL, Victoria Villa, Flint, North Wales.
 FIELDER : GEORGE HAROLD, 55 Broxholm Road, West Norwood, S.E.27.
 GRANGER : WILLIAM FRASER, 8 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.2.
 GREENWOOD : JAMES HENRY, 13 Water Lane, Brixton Hill, S.W.
 GRIFFITH : HUGH NICHOLAS, 31 Tithebarn Road, Southport.
 GUY : WALDO E., Elmtree Cottage, Quickley Lane, Chorley Wood, Herts.
 HAIRD : TOM WILLIAM, 56 Wilberforce Road, Leicester.
 HALLIDAY : FRANKLYN LESLIE, 14 John Dalton Street, Manchester.
 HARDIE : JOHN STEWART, 5 Fourth Avenue, Prescott Road, Old Swan, Liverpool.
 HARDING : FRED HAROLD, 54 Knighton Fields Road, Leicester.
 HARRILD : FRED, 57A High Street, Totnes, S. Devon.
 HAUGHAN : JOHN HOLLIDAY, The Grey House, Silloth, Cumberland.
 HAYWARD : JOHN HAROLD, 60 Grant Street, Glasgow.
 HAYWOOD : ALGAR ARTHUR NEWTON, 15 Farm Street, Mayfair, W.1.
 HEARD : GORDON THOMAS, Elbro House, Princes Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex.
 HOLLIDAY : ALBERT CLIFFORD, School of Architecture University of Liverpool, Liverpool.
 HOWELLS : DAVID JOHN, "Bryn Hywel," Clase Road, Morriston, Swansea.
 HUNT : REGINALD, "The Homestead," Sunningwell Road, Oxford.
 HUNTER : HARRY CORNELIUS, "West View," Hadley Road, New Barnet, Herts.
 JACKSON : HAROLD THOMAS, 52 Cartwright Gardens, W.C.1.
 JOHNSON : CAMPBELL MCALPIN CAMERON, "Monteith," Stroud Road, Gloucester.
 JONES : REGINALD HERBERT ANDREWS, 18 Broughton Road, West Ealing, W.13.
 JONES : RONALD HUGH, 3 Gnoll Avenue, Neath, S. Wales.
 JONES : TOM LEONARD, "Tirydail," Alma Street, Newport, Mon.
 KEESEY : WALTER MONCKTON, M.C., A.R.C.A., 44 Rusholme Road, Putney Hill, S.W.
 KIRBY : EDWARD, c/o 151 Alexandra Road, Wellingborough.
 KNOTT : ALBERT LESLIE, 1 St. Gabriel's Road, Cricklewood, N.W.2.
 LANGDELL : GEORGE ARTHUR, 23 Westcroft Square, Ravenscourt Park, W.6.
 LAVENDER : EDWARD PRICE, Stifford Rectory, near Grays, Essex.
 LAY : ARTHUR PURCELL, 149 Upper Richmond Road, Putney, S.W.
 LEATHART : JULIAN RUDOLPH, 8 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.2.
 LEWIS : GEORGE STANLEY, 4 Ninth Avenue, Old Swan, Liverpool.
 LUKE : REGINALD LATHAM, 72 Oxford Street, W.1.
 MACKAY : NICHOLAS CHARLES, c/o Architectural Association, 35 Bedford Square, W.C.1.
 MCLEAVY : GEORGE EDWARD, 34-5 Bedford Square, W.C.1.
 MAHON : SIDNEY EDWARD, 74 Cambridge Road, Great Crosby, Liverpool.
 MARTIN : NATHANIEL, 158 High Street, Gorleston-on-Sea, Great Yarmouth.
 MASEY : RICHARD JAMES, 20A Maple Road, Anerley, S.E.20.
 MEAGER : KILDARE STUCLEY, 28 Redcliffe Square, S.W.
 MILLER : CLAUDE ST. JOHN GARLE, 8K Bickenhall Mansions, Gloucester Place, W.1.
 MINTY : ROBERT JAMES HUGH, 35 Craven Street, W.C.2.
 MITCHELL : EDWARD ARNOLD, Grove End, Harrow-on-the-Hill.
 NEWTON : PERCY MAURICE, 10 Berkeley Street, Hull.
 NORTON : CHARLES JOSEPH, 1 Bridge Avenue, Hammersmith, W.6.
 OWEN : ARTHUR TREVOR, "Myrtle Bank," Dalmorton Road, New Brighton, Cheshire.
 OWEN : GEOFFREY LEYLAND, 23 Harrowby Road, Seaforth, Liverpool.
 PENMAN : EDWARD MEADOWS, 1 Thorpewood Avenue, Sydenham, S.E.26.
 PRICE : HARRY JAMES PARKIN, 19 Eastholm, Golders Green, N.W.11.
 PRICHARD : LIONEL ARTHUR GEORGE, 17 Sixth Avenue, Old Swan, Liverpool.
 REES : VERNER OWEN, 32 Blandford Road, Bedford Park, N.4.
 REEVES : JOHN EDWARD, 158 Waterloo Road, Smethwick, Birmingham.
 REVITT : GEORGE, Architects' Department, County Offices, Derby.
 RIPPINGHAM : THOMAS FRANCIS, 42 Upper Manor Street, Chelsea, S.W.
 SADLER : WILLIAM, 41 Thornhill Road, N.1.
 SAMPLE : EDWARD FREDRICK RONALD, 38 Grosvenor Terrace, York.
 SCRIVEN : CHARLES, 51A Alexandra Road, South Hampstead, N.W.8.
 SEATON : WILLIAM GEORGE, 22 Mackintosh Road, Pontypriidd, Glam.
 SMITH : ALFRED EDWARD, 48 Tyndale Street, Leicester.
 SMITH : CECIL, 17 Winchester Avenue, Brondesbury, N.W.6.
 STURGEON : JOHN HENRY, 34 Bedford Square, W.C.1.
 SUTCLIFF : THOMAS WILFRID, 22 Edmund Street, Rochdale.
 THORBURN : RICHARD, 200 Portsdown Road, Maida Vale, W.9.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

TOWNSEND : ARTHUR CECIL, 7 Rawlins Street, Fairfield, Liverpool.
 TRIMM : CHARLES ALGERNON, "Firtor," 22 Lower King's Road, Kingston-upon-Thames.
 VON BERG : WILFRED CLEMENT, 113 Rue d'Arras, St. Omer, Pas-de-Calais, France.
 WALKER : REGINALD BECKWICK, 28 Chichele Road, Cricklewood, N.W.2.
 WHITE : CHARLES STANLEY, 34 Bedford Square, W.C.1.
 WILLIAMS : EDWIN, 201 Edge Lane, Liverpool.
 WILLIAMS : HOWARD, "Cartref," 37 Kimberley Road, Roath Park, Cardiff.
 WINN : THOMAS JOHN ROSEWARNE, Trevone, Truro, Cornwall.

The following candidates passed the examinations held in Sydney, N.S.W. :—

INTERMEDIATE.

HURD : SAMUEL JAMES, 55 Pitt Street, Redfern, Sydney, N.S.W.
 TRAILL : STUART JOHN, Hastings Road, Turramurra, Sydney, N.S.W.

SPECIAL OVERSEAS.

WHITLEY : CUTHBERT CLAUDE MORTIER, 37 Harold Street, Hawthorne, Melbourne, Victoria.

SPECIAL WAR.

ROBERTSON : ALEXANDER SMEATON, 456 St. Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria.

Three candidates were relegated in the Special War Examination.

Notices

ELECTION OF MEMBERS, 6 MARCH 1922.

The following applications for election have been received. Notice of any objection or other communication respecting the candidates must be sent to the Secretary for submission to the Council prior to Monday, 6 February 1922.

[See also list published 26 November 1921.]

AS FELLOWS (6).

LENTON : FREDERICK JAMES, M.C. [*A.* 1912], 16 Broad Street, Stamford ; 36 Scotgate, Stamford.
 PICTOR : ARTHUR JOHN [*A.* 1894], 14 Queen Square, Bath ; Bruton, Somerset.
 THOMAS : PERCY EDWARD, O.B.E. [*A.* 1920], 6 and 7 St. John's Square, Cardiff ; Dene Lodge, Cathedral Road, Cardiff.
 TRAYLEN : HENRY FRANCIS [*A.* 1899], 16 Broad Street, Stamford ; 24 St. Martin's, Stamford.
 WALKER : JOHN WILSON [*A.* 1905], 375 Union Street, Aberdeen ; "Kilreen," Stonehaven, Kincardineshire.
 WILSON : ROBERT GORDON, Junr. [*A.* 1902], 375 Union Street, Aberdeen ; 116 Queen's Road, Aberdeen.

AS ASSOCIATES (85).

ALLEN : JOSEPH STANLEY [Special War Examination], 38 Grange Road West, Birkenhead.
 ALLISON : FREDERICK WILLIAM HARFORTH [Special War Examination], 11 Lynton Gardens, Harrogate.
 ALLSFORD : ERNEST HAROLD [Special War Examination], 43 Kingswood Avenue, Brondesbury Park, N.W.6.
 BARNARD : HAROLD THOMAS BENJAMIN [Special War Examination], 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1.

BARTLETT : PERCY JAMES [Special War Examination], 3 Mead Way, Sea Mills Park, Bristol.
 BEASLEY : ALBERT [Special War Examination], 1 Sandringham Road, Sneinton, Nottingham.
 BEAUMONT : EUGENE EDWARD [Special War Examination], 18 Manor Road, Sidcup, Kent.
 BECK : HENRY BERKELEY [Special War Examination], 5 Merryrick Road, Stafford.
 BLOOMFIELD : EDWARD HAMILTON [Special War Examination], 50 Tantallon Road, Balham, S.W.
 BLOOMFIELD : HENRY LANCELOT [Special War Examination], 11 Rothesay Road, Luton.
 BOWRING : JOHN VALENTINE [Special War Examination], "Woodlands," Eastwood, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex.
 BRANSON : PERCY KENNETH [Special War Examination], 123 St. Saviour's Road, Leicester.
 BROOKS : LESLIE CLIFFORD [Special War Examination], 66 Greencroft Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.6.
 BROWN : FRANK COLLIN [Special War Examination], 14 Dartmouth Park Road, N.W.5.
 BROWN : GEORGE TALBOT [Special War Examination], 51 Fawcett Street, Sunderland.
 BUMPSTEAD : ALBERT DENNIS, P.A.S.I. [Special War Examination], 70 Heath Gardens, Twickenham, Middlesex.
 BURNETT : EDGAR [Special War Examination], Weir House, Hickling, Melton Mowbray.
 BURNETT : FREDERICK WANDLASS, M.C. [Special War Examination], 23 Windsor Terrace, Penarth, Glam.
 BYROM : RICHARD [Special War Examination], 221 Tottington Road, Elton, Bury, Lancs.
 CARTER : WILLIAM [Special War Examination], 5 Murton Street, Sunderland.
 CHALLICE : JOHN [Special War Examination], 7 Bedford Circus, Exeter.
 CHECKLEY : GEORGE [Special War Examination], 23 Parkbridge Road, Prenton, Cheshire.
 CLARK : SIDNEY CHARLES [Special War Examination], 3 Ronald Park Avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea.
 COGSWELL : VICTOR GORDON [Special War Examination], "Sunnycote," London Road, North End, Portsmouth.
 COLE : ERIC [Special War Examination], Commerce House, Leckhampton, Cheltenham.
 COOK : HERBERT JAMES [Special War Examination], School House, Ryhope, Sunderland.
 CORDINGLEY : REGINALD ANNANDALE [Special War Examination], 11 Irlam Road, Sale, Cheshire.
 COTTON : GILBERT HENRY [Special War Examination], 60 Regent's Park Road, N.W.1.
 COUCHMAN : HAROLD WILLIAM [Special War Examination], Mount Pleasant House, Tottenham, N.
 COWTAN : ALBERT CHARLES [Special War Examination], "Elm Way," Eastfields Road, Acton, W.3.
 CREEGAN : EDGAR WILSON [Special War Examination], 23A Golders Way, Golders Green, N.W.11.
 DETMOLD : FREDERICK GUY [Special War Examination], 100 Redcliffe Gardens, S.W.10.
 EDWARDS : WILFRID BYTHELL [Special War Examination], Victoria Villa, Flint, N. Wales.
 FIELDER : GEORGE HAROLD [Special War Examination], 55 Broxholm Road, West Norwood, S.E.27.
 GRANGER : WILLIAM FRASER [Special War Examination], 8 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.2.
 GREENWOOD : JAMES HENRY [Special War Examination], 13 Water Lane, Brixton Hill, S.W.
 GRIFFITH : HUGH NICHOLAS [Special War Examination], 31 Tithebarn Road, Southport.
 GUY : WALDO EMERSON [Special War Examination], The Vicarage, Claverley, Shropshire.
 HAIRD : TOM WILLIAM [Special War Examination], 56 Wilberforce Road, Leicester.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

HARDING: FRED HAROLD [Special War Examination], 54 Knighton Fields Road, Leicester.

HAUGHAN: JOHN HOLLIDAY [Special War Examination], The Grey House, Silloth, Cumberland.

HEARD: GORDON THOMAS [Special War Examination], Elbro House, Princes Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex.

HOLLIDAY: ALBERT CLIFFORD [Special War Examination], 61 Ashton Street, Liverpool.

HOWELLS: DAVID JOHN [Special War Examination], "Bryn Hywel," Clase Road, Morriston, Swansea.

HUNT: REGINALD [Special War Examination], The Homestead, Sunningwell Road, Oxford.

HUNTER: HARRY CORNELIUS [Special War Examination], West View, Hadley Road, New Barnet, Herts.

JOHNSON: CAMPBELL McALPIN CAMERON [Special War Examination], "Monteith," Stroud Road, Gloucester.

JONES: REGINALD HERBERT ANDREWS [Special War Examination], 18 Broughton Road, West Ealing, W.13.

JONES: RONALD HUGH [Special War Examination], 3, Groll Avenue, Neath, S. Wales.

JONES: TOM LEONARD [Special War Examination], "Tirydail," Alma Street, Newport, Mon.

KESSEY: WALTER MONCKTON, M.C., A.R.C.A., A.R.E. [Special War Examination], 44 Rusholme Road, Putney, S.W.

KIRBY: EDWARD [Special War Examination], 151 Alexandra Road, Wellingborough, Northants.

KNOTT: ALBERT LESLIE [Special War Examination], 1 St. Gabriel's Road, Cricklewood, N.W.2.

LANGDELL: GEORGE ARTHUR [Special War Examination], 23 Westcroft Square, Ravenscourt Park, W.6.

LAVENDER: EDWARD PRICE [Special War Examination], Stifford Rectory, Grays, Essex.

LEATHART: JULIAN RUDOLPH [Special War Examination], 8 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.2.

LEWIS: GEORGE STANLEY [Special War Examination], 4 Ninth Avenue, Old Swan, Liverpool.

LUKE: REGINALD LATHAM [Special War Examination], 72 Oxford Street, W.

MAHON: SIDNEY EDWARD [Special War Examination], 74 Cambridge Road, Great Crosby, Liverpool.

MARTIN: NATHANIEL [Special War Examination], Scottish Club, Endsleigh Gardens, Euston Road, W.

MAUGER: PAUL VICTOR EDISON [Special War Examination], 250A, Gloucester Terrace, W.2.

MILLER: CLAUDE ST. JOHN GARLE [Special War Examination], 8K Bickenhall Mansions, Gloucester Place, W.1.

MINTY: ROBERT JAMES HUGH [Special War Examination], 35 Craven Street, Charing Cross, W.C.2.

MITCHELL: EDWARD ARNOLD [Special War Examination], 17 Hanover Square, W.1.

NEWTON: PERCY MAURICE [Special War Examination], 10 Berkeley Street, Hull.

NORTON: CHARLES JOSEPH [Special War Examination], 1 Bridge Avenue, Hammersmith, W.6.

OWEN: ARTHUR TREVOR [Special War Examination], "Myrtle Bank," Dalmorton Road, New Brighton, Cheshire.

PENMAN: EDWARD MEADOWS [Special War Examination], 1 Thorpewood Avenue, Sydenham, S.E.26.

PRICE: HARRY JAMES PARKIN [Special War Examination], 19 Eastholm, Golders Green, N.W.11.

PRICHARD: LIONEL ARTHUR GEORGE [Special War Examination], 17 Sixth Avenue, Old Swan, Liverpool.

REES: VERNER OWEN [Special War Examination], 32 Blandford Road, Bedford Park, W.4.

REVITT: GEORGE [Special War Examination], County Offices, St. Mary's Gate, Derby.

RIPPINGHAM: THOMAS FRANCIS [Special War Examination], 42 Upper Manor Street, Chelsea, S.W.

SCRIVEN: CHARLES [Special War Examination], 51A Alexandra Road, South Hampstead, N.W.8.

SMITH: ALFRED EWART [Special War Examination], 48 Tynedale Street, Leicester.

SMITH: CECIL [Special War Examination], 17 Winchester Avenue, Brondesbury, N.W.6.

STURGEON: JOHN HENRY [Special War Examination], 13 Chesham Terrace, King's Cliff, Brighton.

SUTCLIFFE: THOMAS WILFRID [Special War Examination], 22 Edmund Street, Rochdale, Lancs.

THORBURN: RICHARD [Special War Examination], 200 Portsdown Road, Maida Vale, W.9.

TRIMM: CHARLES ALGERNON, M.C. [Special War Examination], "Firtor," 22 Lower King's Road, Kingston-upon-Thames.

WALKER: REGINALD BECKWICK [Special War Examination], 28 Chichele Road, Cricklewood, N.W.2.

WHITE: CHARLES STANLEY [Special War Examination], 34 Bedford Square, W.C.1.

WILLIAMS: EDWIN [Special War Examination], 201 Edge Lane, Liverpool.

WILLIAMS: HOWARD [Special War Examination], "Cartref," 37 Kimberley Road, Roath Park, Cardiff.

WINN: THOMAS JOHN ROSEWARNE [Special War Examination], Trevone, Truro, Cornwall.

Subscriptions, Contributions and Fees from Fellows, Associates, Licentiatees and Students became due on 1 January as follows:—

Fellows	£5	5	0
Associates	3	3	0
Licentiatees	2	2	0
Students	0	10	6

Members' Column

Members, Licentiatees, and Students may insert announcements and make known their requirements in this column without charge. Communications must be addressed to the Editor, and be accompanied by the full name and address. Where anonymity is desired, box numbers will be given and answers forwarded.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.

MR. H. J. VENNING has removed to No. 5 Bedford Row, W.C.1. Telephone: Chancery 7431.

OFFICE TO LET.

LIGHT OFFICE to let in Bedford Row, suitable for Architect or Quantity Surveyor; telephone and other facilities.—Apply Box 522, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A.

MESSRS. WELCH AND HOLLIS.

MR. HERBERT A. WELCH, A.R.I.B.A., has taken into partnership as from 1 January last Mr. H. Clifford Hollis, A.R.I.B.A., and the practice will in future be carried on under the title of Messrs. Welch and Hollis. The address, No. 7 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C., will remain unchanged.

OFFICE ACCOMMODATION.

A FELLOW desires offices in the City on or before 25 March. See JOURNAL, 12 November.—Box 3101, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A.

PARTNERSHIP.

AN ARCHITECT in practice in the City is prepared to join another in partnership or on terms to combine in office establishment.—Address Box 22, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, W.1.

ASSOCIATE 1902. Captain, 4½ years' service. London experience. Engineering knowledge, also fair Quantity Surveyor. Housing and Town Planning. Desires a partnership.—Apply Box 3122, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, London, W.1.

ASSOCIATE (35), holding £1,000 per annum London appointment for past 3 years, desires to purchase partnership or practice; provinces or London; capital, £1,000; minimum income £400.—Box 1112, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, W.1.

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS

APPOINTMENTS WANTED.

A.R.I.B.A. (38), University Graduate (ex-officer, major), pre-war practice, desires appointment with a view to acquiring an interest in an established firm in London. Varied experience, including the design of Banks and large Public Buildings.—Address Box 21, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, W.1.

PROBATIONER R.I.B.A., age 22, recently completed Articles, seeks appointment as Improver. Good draughtsman, experience on large housing scheme, and general work. Ex-Service man.—Box 1122, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, London, W.1.

F.R.I.B.A. recommends youth anxious to get into architect's office as office-boy. Has some taste for draughtsmanship, and is willing to learn.—Apply Box 2021, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, W.1.

A.R.I.B.A. (29), Associate member of the Town Planning Institute, desires engagement. Accustomed to supervising office staff and works in course of construction. Previously employed as architectural chief assistant. All-round experience and special knowledge of town planning and estate development.—Box 5122, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A.

A.R.I.B.A. Nearly 20 years' experience in big offices, on banks, offices, shops, warehouses, factories, flats, hotels, hospitals, baths, housing and domestic works. Used to taking charge of office and buildings. Present engagement terminating through lack of work. Desires responsible position.—Box 7122, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, London, W.1.

A.R.I.B.A. desires appointment; is prepared to acquire an interest in established firm after probationary period. Eighteen years' varied experience. Ex-R.A. Schools student. Would join architect in competition or speculative work on mutual terms.—Address Box 1421, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, London, W.1.

A.R.I.B.A. (35), ex-officer, disengaged owing to reduction of staff, has recently held a responsible appointment under a County Council. All-round experience. Highest credentials.—Address Box 144, c/o Secretary R.I.B.A., 9 Conduit Street, W.1.

Minutes VI

SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING—HOUSING FEES.

At a Special General Meeting, summoned by the Council under By-law 65, and held on Thursday, 22 December 1921, at 5.30 p.m., Professor S. D. Adshead, Vice-President, in the Chair; the attendance book was signed by 24 Fellows (including 5 members of the Council), 9 Associates, and 4 Licentiates.

The Minutes of the Special General Meeting, held on 28 November 1921, were taken as read and signed as correct.

The Secretary read a letter, dated 20 December, from Mr. J. H. Kennard [F.], in which he contended that the Meeting on 28 November was not properly constituted under the By-laws, that the business transacted thereat must be regarded as void, and that it was consequently impossible to transact the business on the Agenda paper.

The Chairman ruled that the Meeting on 28 November was properly constituted, and that there was no reason for not proceeding with the business before the meeting.

The Chairman reminded the meeting of the following Resolutions which had been passed at the meeting on 28 November—

1. That while reaffirming the objections to Memoranda Nos. 51 (D) and 52, which led to the Resolution of 4 July 1921, this Meeting recognises the *bona fides* of the Ministry in putting forward Memoranda Nos. 51 (D) and 52 under the impression that the R.I.B.A. had agreed thereto.

2. That the Ministry of Health be requested to amend and re-draft the terms of the engagement of architects in connection with housing schemes in conjunction with accredited representatives of the Royal Institute.

3. That for this purpose three members be appointed with full powers to agree with the Ministry upon a scale for abandoned work and upon the matters referred to in the

Second Resolution within limits prescribed by the Practice Standing Committee in consultation with interested architects.

4. That the names suggested—namely, those of Messrs. W. R. Davidge, Herbert A. Welch, Francis Jones, Sydney Perks, Wm. Woodward, H. T. Buckland, and Courtenay Crickmer—be referred to the Practice Standing Committee, and that the Committee be requested to consider these names and others and to submit six names to a General Meeting of the Royal Institute with a view to the selection of three of them by ballot.

—and stated that, in accordance with the terms of the fourth Resolution, the Practice Standing Committee had considered the matter referred to them, and had decided to submit the names of the following six members to the Special General Meeting with a view to the selection of three of them by ballot:

Mr. E. G. Allen, F.R.I.B.A.
Mr. Henry V. Ashley, F.R.I.B.A.
Mr. H. T. Buckland, F.R.I.B.A.
Mr. W. R. Davidge, F.R.I.B.A.
Mr. Francis Jones, F.R.I.B.A.
Mr. Herbert A. Welch, A.R.I.B.A.

The Secretary read a letter from Mr. W. R. Davidge, withdrawing his name from the list.

A vote by ballot was then taken, and the votes were counted by Mr. W. W. Scott-Moncrieff [F.] and Mr. A. Welford [A.], who were appointed scrutineers by the meeting, and the Chairman declared that the following members had been duly elected:

Mr. H. T. Buckland [F.] (Birmingham).
Mr. Francis Jones [F.] (Manchester).
Mr. Herbert A. Welch [A.] (London).

The meeting terminated at 6.10 p.m.

Minutes VII

At the Fifth General Meeting (Business) of the Session 1921-1922, held on Monday, 9 January 1922, at 8 p.m.—Mr. Paul Waterhouse, President, in the Chair. The attendance book was signed by 14 Fellows (including 7 members of the Council), 10 Associates, and 1 Licentiate.

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 December, having been taken as read, were agreed as correct.

The Hon. Secretary announced the decease of Mr. James Henry La Trobe, elected *Associate* 1886 and *Fellow* 1893, of the firm of Messrs. La Trobe and Weston, of Bristol, and it was RESOLVED that the regrets of the Royal Institute for his loss be entered on the Minutes and that a message of sympathy and condolence be conveyed to his relatives.

Messrs. P. J. Hiorns [A.] and F. L. Johnson [A.], attending for the first time since their election, were formally admitted by the President.

The following candidates for membership were elected by show of hands:—

AS FELLOWS (2).

BENNETT: THOMAS PENBERTHY [A. 1912], London.
FOSTER: REGINALD CHARLES [A. 1909], Buckhurst Hill, Essex.

AS ASSOCIATES (5).

BASTO: ANTONIO HERMENEGILDO DE SENNA FERNANDES, London.
FORSHAW: JOHN HENRY, M.C., Ormskirk, Lancs.
PLEDGE: CHARLES TERRY, London.
POPE: CLEMENT LAWRENCE, Wimborne, Dorset.
SHEPPARD: EVERARD, Beckenham.

The proceedings closed at 8.15 p.m.

e
.
y
s
f
f
n
d
e
l
:

-
d
y

-
al
as
o
g
es
of
as
be
d
l.
d
y

x.
s,